arXiv:1209.2151v1 [astro-ph.HE] 10 Sep 2012

Conservative 3+1 General Relativistic Variable Eddington Tensor Radiation Transport Equations

Christian Y. Cardall,[1,2] Eirik Endeve,[3] and Anthony Mezzacappa[1,2,3]
[1]*Physics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6354, USA*
[2]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1200, USA*
[3]*Computer Science and Mathematics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6354, USA*

(Dated: September 12, 2012)

We present conservative 3+1 general relativistic variable Eddington tensor radiation transport equations, including greater elaboration of the momentum space divergence (that is, the energy derivative term) than in previous work. These equations are intended for use in simulations involving numerical relativity, particularly in the absence of spherical symmetry. The independent variables are the lab frame coordinate basis spacetime position coordinates and the particle energy measured in the comoving frame. With an eye towards astrophysical applications—such as core-collapse supernovae and compact object mergers—in which the fluid includes nuclei and/or nuclear matter at finite temperature, and in which the transported particles are neutrinos, we pay special attention to the consistency of four-momentum and lepton number exchange between neutrinos and the fluid, showing the term-by-term cancellations that must occur for this consistency to be achieved.

PACS numbers: 95.30.Jx, 05.20.Dd, 47.70.-n, 97.60.Bw

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutrino transport is a necessary ingredient of core-collapse supernova simulations [1–3]. Determining the fate of the stellar material—for instance, does an explosion happen, and if so, how?—requires calculation of the four-momentum and lepton number exchange between the fluid (which includes nuclei and/or nuclear matter at finite temperature) and the neutrinos that stream from and through it. For the purpose of studying the explosion mechanism, we take the traditional approach and consider only massless neutrinos described by classical distribution functions (phase space densities) $f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$. (Calculation of the emerging neutrino signals—of intrinsic interest as an observational probe of the core-collapse supernova environment, and of the properties of the neutrinos themselves—definitely requires treatment of the quantum effects induced by neutrino mass and flavor mixing [4–6]. Recent explorations suggest that flavor mixing does not impact the explosion mechansim [7–13], but consensus on the impacts of flavor mixing in supernovae has a fickle history, and future more definitive simulations that include neutrino transport with quantum kinetics could surprise us with flavor mixing effects on the explosion mechanism as well.)

The formidable challenge of solving for the neutrino distribution functions $f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ can be ameliorated by solving only for their angular moments, with some form of closure serving to truncate the scheme at low order. Common examples include flux-limited diffusion [14],[15],[16], truncated at the zeroth moment $\mathcal{J}(t, \mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$, with prescriptions for the first and second moments $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{\imath}}(t, \mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$ and $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}}(t, \mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$; and a variable Eddington tensor approach [17–23], truncated at the first moment $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{\imath}}(t, \mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$, with prescriptions for the second and third moments $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}}(t, \mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}\hat{k}}(t, \mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$ (see Sec. II C). (Note that Refs. [19, 21, 22] integrate out the neutrino energy as well as angle dependence, which entails several major simplifications: in addition to the further reduction of dimensionality, it eliminates neutrino-energy-changing interactions, velocity-dependent terms, and the third moment $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}\hat{k}}$. On the importance of the neutrino-energy-changing interactions and velocity-dependent terms, see Ref. [24].)

Notably for the focus of this paper, conservative 3+1 general relativistic variable Eddington tensor radiation moment equations are presented by Shibata et al. [20]. Their variables are functions of lab frame coordinate basis spacetime position coordinates x^μ—that is, the spacetime coordinates that appear in the 3+1 metric—but the momentum space dependence is on the neutrino energy ϵ measured in the comoving frame. The long-recognized freedom to choose different coordinate systems for spacetime and momentum space (e.g. Refs. [25–31]) allows particle/fluid interactions to be evaluated in the comoving frame in the context of Eulerian grid-based approaches to multidimensional spatial dependence.

Apart from the fact that we leave aside for now discussion of specific closure prescriptions and contributions to the collision integral (which are stories unto themselves), one difference between our presentation from that of Shibata et al. [20] is our starting point. Like Endeve et al. [23], we begin from conservative reformulations [32] of the general relativistic Boltzmann equation [25, 29, 30, 33, 34] rather than the moments formalism of Thorne [35]. By angular integration of the four-momentum conservative reformulation of the Boltzmann equation, we obtain in Sec. II a general relativistic variable Eddington tensor formalism in which the relationship between the lab frame (denoted by unadorned indices) and the comoving frame (denoted by hatted indices) is expressed in terms of coordinate transformations $L^{\mu}{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and comoving frame connection coefficients $\Gamma^{\hat{\mu}}{}_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\rho}}$

(see also Ref. [23]).

In specializing to the 3+1 formulation of general relativity in Sec. III, we extend the treatment of Shibata et al. [20] with a full elaboration of the momentum space divergence (i.e. the energy derivative term, in this angle-integrated moments case). Important aspects of our approach include (a) consistent use of what we call 'Eulerian decompositions' and 'Eulerian projections,' which are natural to the 3+1 approach; and relatedly, (b) a shift from conceptualizing the relationship between the lab and comoving frames from coordinate transformations $L^{\mu}{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ to the (covariant) relative three-velocity v^{μ} connecting the four-velocities n^{μ} and u^{μ} of Eulerian and Lagrangian observers. Our approach in Sec. III is more geometric than that in Sec. II (in conception if not notation); indeed it allows us to obtain explicit results while almost completely avoiding encounters with connection coefficients.

We also add to the treatment by Shibata et al. [20] by showing, in both Sec. II and Sec. III, how the four-momentum exchange with the fluid expressed by a conservative variable Eddington tensor formalism is consistent with a conservative treatment of lepton number exchange (see also Ref. [23]). A conservative treatment of four-momentum exchange with the fluid, properly discretized for consistency with conservative number exchange, is expected to facilitate simultaneous energy and lepton conservation in numerical simulations—an important check on the physical reliability of simulation outcomes [36]. In this respect, there may be room for improvement over cases in which this consistency has not been considered (e.g. Refs. [21, 22]), or in which consistency between conservative number exchange and *non-conservative* four-momentum exchange has been addressed (e.g. Ref. [18]). The nature of the consistency of our conservative four-momentum transport equations (modulo gravitational sources) with a conservative number transport equation is made particularly explicit in Sec. III, in which we elucidate the term-by-term cancellations that must occur for this consistency to be achieved.

II. GENERAL RELATIVATISTIC VARIABLE EDDINGTON TENSOR FORMALISM

After exhibiting the Boltzmann equation and its conservative reformulations in terms of number and four-momentum exchange with the fluid, we obtain from the latter a variable Eddington tensor formalism in which the relationship between the lab frame (denoted by unadorned indices) and the comoving frame (denoted by hatted indices) is expressed in terms of coordinate transformations $L^{\mu}{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and comoving frame connection coefficients $\Gamma^{\hat{\mu}}{}_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\rho}}$, and show how it relates to the angle-integrated number-conservative reformulation. This ground is also covered in Ref. [23], but is considered here to establish notation and provide a self-contained presentation.

A. The Boltzmann equation

Classical neutrino distribution functions $f(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ are governed by the Boltzmann equation [25, 29, 30, 33, 34]. In its geometric form, it states that the change in f along a phase space trajectory with affine parameter λ is equal to the phase space density $C[f]$ of point-like collisions that add or remove particles from the trajectory:

$$\frac{df}{d\lambda} = C[f]. \tag{1}$$

The phase space measure is defined in such a way that f and $C[f]$ are both invariant scalars. For practical computations it is necessary to introduce phase space coordinates: spacetime coordinates x^{μ}, and momentum space coordinates p^i (the timelike momentum component p^0 is fixed in terms of the spacelike components p^i by the mass shell constraint). In terms of these coordinates, Eq. (1) becomes

$$\frac{dx^{\mu}}{d\lambda}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^{\mu}} + \frac{dp^i}{d\lambda}\frac{\partial f}{\partial p^i} = C[f]. \tag{2}$$

The geodesic equations describing the trajectory are

$$\frac{dx^{\mu}}{d\lambda} = p^{\mu}, \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{dp^{\mu}}{d\lambda} = -\Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho} p^{\nu} p^{\rho}, \tag{4}$$

so that Eq. (2) becomes

$$p^{\mu}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^{\mu}} - \Gamma^{i}_{\nu\mu} p^{\nu} p^{\mu}\frac{\partial f}{\partial p^i} = C[f], \tag{5}$$

now an integro-partial differential equation (the integrals appearing on the right-hand side).

There is freedom in choosing the spacetime and momentum space coordinates. Taking the unadorned indices to denote what we shall call a lab frame coordinate basis (also called a 'natural' or 'holonomic' basis), the connection coefficients $\Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho}$ are given in terms of the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$\Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho} = \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\sigma}\left(\frac{\partial g_{\sigma\nu}}{\partial x^{\rho}} + \frac{\partial g_{\sigma\rho}}{\partial x^{\nu}} - \frac{\partial g_{\nu\rho}}{\partial x^{\sigma}}\right). \tag{6}$$

However, it is most convenient to express the particle interactions entering $C[f]$ in terms of momentum components $p^{\hat{\imath}}$ reckoned with respect to an orthonormal reference frame comoving with the fluid (a 'comoving frame'). We define a composite transformation

$$L^{\mu}{}_{\hat{\mu}} = e^{\mu}{}_{\bar{\mu}} \Lambda^{\bar{\mu}}{}_{\hat{\mu}} \tag{7}$$

consisting of a Lorentz boost $\Lambda^{\bar{\mu}}{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ from an orthonormal comoving frame (denoted by indices with a hat) to an orthonormal lab frame (denoted by indices with a bar), followed by a transformation to the lab frame coordinate basis with a local tetrad $e^{\mu}{}_{\bar{\mu}}$. This tetrad is independent of the fluid velocity; it locally transforms the metric into the Lorentz form $(\eta_{\bar\mu\bar\nu}) = \mathrm{diag}[-1,1,1,1]$:

$$e^{\mu}{}_{\bar\mu} e^{\nu}{}_{\bar\nu}\, g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\bar\mu\bar\nu}. \tag{8}$$

Of course, the boost $\Lambda^{\bar\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}$ preserves the Lorentz metric; this implies that the composite transformation $L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}$ is itself also a tetrad. The inverse of Eq. (7) is

$$L^{\hat\mu}{}_{\mu} = \Lambda^{\hat\mu}{}_{\bar\mu} e^{\bar\mu}{}_{\mu}, \tag{9}$$

expressed in terms of the inverse tetrad $e^{\bar\mu}{}_{\mu}$ and inverse boost $\Lambda^{\hat\mu}{}_{\bar\mu}$. In terms of lab frame coordinate basis spacetime components and comoving frame momentum components, the Boltzmann equation reads

$$L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu} p^{\hat\mu} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^{\mu}} - \Gamma^{\hat\imath}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu} p^{\hat\nu} p^{\hat\mu} \frac{\partial f}{\partial p^{\hat\imath}} = C[f], \tag{10}$$

where the connection coefficients in the comoving frame are

$$\Gamma^{\hat\mu}_{\hat\nu\hat\rho} = L^{\hat\mu}{}_{\mu} L^{\nu}{}_{\hat\nu} L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho}\, \Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\rho} + L^{\hat\mu}{}_{\mu} L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho} \frac{\partial L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\nu}}{\partial x^{\rho}}. \tag{11}$$

Finally, assuming particles of zero mass, it is convenient to express the comoving frame null momentum components in terms of energy, polar angle, and azimuthal angle, that is, in terms of momentum space spherical polar coordinates (denoted by indices with a tilde) $\left(p^{\tilde\imath}\right) = (\epsilon, \vartheta, \varphi)^{T}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(p^{\hat\mu}\right) &= \epsilon \left(1, \ell^{\hat 1}, \ell^{\hat 2}, \ell^{\hat 3}\right)^{T} \\ &= \epsilon \left(1, \cos\vartheta, \sin\vartheta\cos\varphi, \sin\vartheta\sin\varphi\right)^{T}, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

which also defines the unit normal three-vector $\ell^{\hat\imath}$ tangent to the comoving-frame three-momentum $p^{\hat\imath}$. In terms of these momentum space coordinates the Boltzmann equation now reads

$$L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu} p^{\hat\mu} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^{\mu}} - \Gamma^{\hat\imath}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu} p^{\hat\nu} p^{\hat\mu} \frac{\partial p^{\tilde\jmath}}{\partial p^{\hat\imath}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial p^{\tilde\jmath}} = C[f], \tag{13}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial p^{\tilde\jmath}}{\partial p^{\hat\imath}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon\cos\vartheta & \epsilon\sin\vartheta\cos\varphi & \epsilon\sin\vartheta\sin\varphi \\ -\sin\vartheta & \cos\vartheta\cos\varphi & \cos\vartheta\sin\varphi \\ 0 & -\sin\varphi/\sin\vartheta & \cos\varphi/\sin\vartheta \end{pmatrix} \tag{14}$$

is the Jacobian relating momentum space spherical and Cartesian coordinates.

B. Conservative reformulations of the Boltzmann equation

Conservative reformulations of the Boltzmann equation are available [32] that render plain its connection to number and four-momentum conservation (or balance, given the presence of source terms), and therefore may be helpful in attempts to maintain fidelity to global conservation laws in numerical simulations.

The number-conservative reformulation of Eq. (13) is

$$S_N + M_N = C[f], \tag{15}$$

with spacetime divergence S_N and momentum space divergence M_N given by

$$S_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}} \left(\sqrt{-g}\, L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}\, p^{\hat\mu}\, f\right), \tag{16}$$

$$M_N = \frac{1}{\epsilon\sin\vartheta} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^{\tilde\jmath}} \left(-\epsilon\sin\vartheta\, \Gamma^{\hat\imath}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu} \frac{\partial p^{\tilde\jmath}}{\partial p^{\hat\imath}}\, p^{\hat\nu} p^{\hat\mu} f\right). \tag{17}$$

When Eq. (15) is integrated over the invariant momentum space volume element (e.g. Ref. [25])

$$\begin{aligned} dP &= \sqrt{-g}\, \varepsilon_{ijk} \frac{d_1 p^{i}\, d_2 p^{j}\, d_3 p^{k}}{(-p_0)} && (18) \\ &= \epsilon\sin\vartheta\, d\epsilon\, d\vartheta\, d\varphi, && (19) \end{aligned}$$

the momentum space divergence term manifestly disappears, leaving the number balance equation

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}} \left(\sqrt{-g}\, N^{\mu}\right) = \int C[f]\, \frac{dP}{(2\pi)^3}, \tag{20}$$

where

$$N^{\mu} = \int p^{\mu} f\, \frac{dP}{(2\pi)^3} \tag{21}$$

is the number flux vector (e.g. Ref. [25]), expressed here in terms of the lab frame coordinate basis (note $p^{\mu} = L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}\, p^{\hat\mu}$). We use units in which $\hbar = c = 1$; relative to works in which instead $h = c = 1$, this leads to the factors of $(2\pi)^3$ in the preceding two equations.

Similarly, the four-momentum-conservative reformulation of Eq. (13) is

$$(S_T)^{\rho} + (M_T)^{\rho} = L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho}\, p^{\hat\rho}\, C[f], \tag{22}$$

with spacetime divergence S_T and momentum space divergence M_T given by

$$\begin{aligned} (S_T)^{\rho} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}} \left(\sqrt{-g}\, L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho} L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}\, p^{\hat\rho} p^{\hat\mu}\, f\right) \\ &\quad + \Gamma^{\rho}_{\nu\mu}\, L^{\nu}{}_{\hat\nu} L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}\, p^{\hat\nu} p^{\hat\mu} f, && (23) \\ (M_T)^{\rho} &= \frac{1}{\epsilon\sin\vartheta} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^{\tilde\jmath}} \left(-\epsilon\sin\vartheta\, \Gamma^{\hat\imath}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu} \frac{\partial p^{\tilde\jmath}}{\partial p^{\hat\imath}}\, L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho}\, p^{\hat\rho} p^{\hat\nu} p^{\hat\mu} f\right). && (24) \end{aligned}$$

When integrated over dP, Eq. (22) yields the four-momentum balance equation

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}} \left(\sqrt{-g}\, T^{\rho\mu}\right) + \Gamma^{\rho}_{\nu\mu}\, T^{\nu\mu} = \int p^{\rho}\, C[f]\, \frac{dP}{(2\pi)^3}, \tag{25}$$

where

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \int p^{\mu} p^{\nu} f\, \frac{dP}{(2\pi)^3} \tag{26}$$

is the stress-energy tensor (e.g. Ref. [25]), expressed here in terms of the lab frame coordinate basis.

C. Variable Eddington tensor formalism

Solving for f in its full dimensionality being computationally overwhelming, the dimensionality of the problem can be reduced by considering only its lowest angular moments. A truncation of the hierarchy of moments must be performed by means of closure relations (see e.g. the references in Sec. I). Just as it is most convenient to describe neutrino interactions with the fluid in terms of momentum components reckoned in the comoving frame, so also it seems sensible to define angular moments and prescribe closure relations in the comoving frame. We define the lowest angular moments of $f\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon, \Omega\right)$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{J}\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon\right) = \epsilon \int f\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon, \Omega\right)\, d\Omega, \tag{27}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath}\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon\right) = \epsilon \int \ell^{\hat\imath}\, f\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon, \Omega\right)\, d\Omega, \tag{28}$$

$$\mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon\right) = \epsilon \int \ell^{\hat\imath}\ell^{\hat\jmath}\, f\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon, \Omega\right)\, d\Omega, \tag{29}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k}\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon\right) = \epsilon \int \ell^{\hat\imath}\ell^{\hat\jmath}\ell^{\hat k}\, f\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon, \Omega\right)\, d\Omega, \tag{30}$$

where $\ell^{\hat\imath}$ is the unit three-vector tangent to the three-momentum in the comoving frame, defined in connection with Eq. (12). The integration over $d\Omega = \sin\vartheta\, d\vartheta\, d\varphi$ is performed over the unit sphere. Note that the energy dependence is retained; these monochromatic moments are functions of lab frame coordinate basis spacetime position components x^{μ} and the comoving frame energy ϵ. (This is the first instance of a convention we employ, of denoting monochromatic or energy-dependent quantities with script symbols.) The flux-limited diffusion approximation entails truncation of the hierarchy at the zeroth moment $\mathcal{J}$, with prescriptions for the first and second moments $\mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath}$ and $\mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}$ in terms of $\mathcal{J}$. In the variable Eddington tensor approach the hierarchy is truncated at $\mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath}$, with the next higher moments rewritten as

$$\mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath} = k^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}\mathcal{J}, \tag{31}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k} = l^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k}\mathcal{J}, \tag{32}$$

that is,

$$k^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath} = \frac{\int \ell^{\hat\imath}\ell^{\hat\jmath}\, f\, d\Omega}{\int f\, d\Omega}, \tag{33}$$

$$l^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k} = \frac{\int \ell^{\hat\imath}\ell^{\hat\jmath}\ell^{\hat k}\, f\, d\Omega}{\int f\, d\Omega}. \tag{34}$$

A number of different approaches to computing the Eddington tensors $k^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}$ and $l^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k}$ might be taken; see for instance the references in Ref. [23].

We choose the variable Eddington tensor approach, and note that we require four equations for the four unknowns $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath}$ (in addition to whatever scheme is used to compute the Eddington tensors). Inspection of Eqs. (22)-(26) indicates that the four-momentum conservative formulation of the Boltzmann equation may serve as a suitable basis for the four equations we require. They are suggestive of conservative evolution of zeroth and first moments in the lab frame coordinate basis, which may prove helpful in maintaining numerical four-momentum conservation; yet the arguments of the spacetime and momentum space divergences can nevertheless be expressed in terms of the comoving-frame moments $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath}$ we must take as our primitive unknowns.

We prepare to implement this strategy with some additional definitions. We define a monochromatic stress energy, whose components are functions of lab frame coordinate basis spacetime position components x^{μ} and the comoving frame energy ϵ:

$$\mathcal{T}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon\right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int p^{\hat\mu}p^{\hat\nu}\, f\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon, \Omega\right)\, d\Omega. \tag{35}$$

Its components are related to the comoving frame moments by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{T}^{\hat0\hat0} & \mathcal{T}^{\hat0\hat\jmath} \\ \mathcal{T}^{\hat\imath\hat0} & \mathcal{T}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{J} & \mathcal{H}^{\hat\jmath} \\ \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} & \mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{J} & \mathcal{H}^{\hat\jmath} \\ \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} & k^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}\mathcal{J} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{36}$$

Similarly we define

$$\mathcal{U}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu\hat\rho}\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon\right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int p^{\hat\mu}p^{\hat\nu}p^{\hat\rho}\, f\left(x^{\mu}, \epsilon, \Omega\right)\, d\Omega, \tag{37}$$

whose components are given by

$$\mathcal{U}^{\hat0\hat\mu\hat\nu} = \mathcal{U}^{\hat\mu\hat0\hat\nu} = \mathcal{U}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu\hat0} = \epsilon\, \mathcal{T}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}, \tag{38}$$

$$\mathcal{U}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k} = \epsilon\mathcal{L}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k} = \epsilon\, l^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k}\mathcal{J}. \tag{39}$$

The bottom line is that all the components of both $\mathcal{T}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu\hat\rho}$ are just our primitive unknowns $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath}$, modulo factors (taken to be known) of ϵ, $k^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}$, and $l^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath\hat k}$.

We obtain our equations for $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath}$ by integrating Eq. (22) over $d\Omega$ and dividing by ϵ:

$$(\mathsf{S}_T)^{\rho} + (\mathsf{M}_T)^{\rho} = L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho}\int \frac{p^{\hat\rho}}{\epsilon}\, C[f]\, d\Omega, \tag{40}$$

where the angle-integrated spacetime divergence $(\mathsf{S}_T)^{\rho}$ and momentum space divergence $(\mathsf{M}_T)^{\rho}$ (now denoted in a sans-serif font to distinguish them from the unintegrated $(S_T)^{\rho}$ and $(M_T)^{\rho}$) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathsf{S}_T)^{\rho} = {} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}}\left(\sqrt{-g}\, L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho}L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}\, \mathcal{T}^{\hat\rho\hat\mu}\right) \\ & + \Gamma^{\rho}_{\nu\mu}\, L^{\nu}{}_{\hat\nu}L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}\, \mathcal{T}^{\hat\nu\hat\mu}, \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

$$(\mathsf{M}_T)^{\rho} = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon\, L^{\rho}{}_{\hat\rho}\int \Gamma^{\hat\imath}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu}\, \frac{\partial p^{\tilde\imath}}{\partial p^{\hat\imath}}\, p^{\hat\rho}p^{\hat\nu}p^{\hat\mu}\, f\, d\Omega\right). \tag{42}$$

To further simplify $(\mathsf{M}_T)^{\rho}$, note that

$$\frac{\partial p^{\tilde\imath}}{\partial p^{\hat\imath}} = \frac{p_{\hat\imath}}{\epsilon} \tag{43}$$

by virtue of Eq. (12) and the first row of Eq. (14); and that [23, 32]

$$\Gamma^{\hat{\imath}}_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}\, p_{\hat{\imath}}\, p^{\hat{\nu}} p^{\hat{\mu}} = \epsilon\, \Gamma^{\hat{0}}_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}\, p^{\hat{\nu}} p^{\hat{\mu}}. \tag{44}$$

This equation, which follows from $0 = d\left(p^{\hat{\mu}} p_{\hat{\mu}}\right)/d\lambda = 2\, p_{\hat{\mu}}\, dp^{\hat{\mu}}/d\lambda$ and Eq. (4), is important because it makes only the third (rather than fourth) moment appear [23]. With these relations we obtain

$$(\mathsf{M}_T)^\rho = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\, L^\rho{}_{\hat{\rho}}\, \Gamma^{\hat{0}}_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}\, \mathcal{U}^{\hat{\rho}\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}\right) \tag{45}$$

for the angle-integrated momentum space divergence.

Equations (40), (41), and (45) are the relations we seek. They provide four equations ($\rho = 0, 1, 2, 3$) for our four primitive unknowns $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{\imath}}$, the comoving frame angular moments; this is because the components of $\mathcal{T}^{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}\hat{\rho}}$ are in fact $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{\imath}}$, modulo factors (taken to be known) of the comoving energy ϵ and Eddington tensors $k^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}}$ and $l^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}\hat{k}}$ (see Eqs. (36), (38), and (39)). Moreover, Eqs. (40), (41), and (45) are conservative in (that is, expressed in terms of divergences with respect to) our chosen phase space coordinates—the lab frame coordinate basis spacetime position coordinates x^μ and the comoving frame neutrino energy ϵ.

D. Four-momentum and lepton number exchange

The right-hand side of Eq. (40) is intimately related to source terms for the fluid energy and momentum equations. From the right-hand side of Eq. (40), the monochromatic four-momentum source q_a^ν for neutrino species a is

$$q_a^\nu = L^\nu{}_{\hat{\mu}} \int \frac{p^{\hat{\mu}}}{\epsilon}\, C_a[f]\, d\Omega. \tag{46}$$

Integrating $\epsilon^2/(2\pi)^3$ times Eqs. (40), (41), and (45) over neutrino energy ϵ for a particular neutrino species a, we have

$$\nabla_\mu T_a^{\nu\mu} = \int q_a^\nu\, \frac{\epsilon^2\, d\epsilon}{(2\pi)^3} \equiv Q_a^\nu, \tag{47}$$

where ∇_μ denotes the covariant derivative. The divergence of the total stress-energy—which includes the fluid and all species of neutrinos—must vanish:

$$\nabla_\mu \left(T^{\nu\mu}_{\text{fluid}} + \sum_a T_a^{\nu\mu}\right) = 0. \tag{48}$$

By virtue of Eq. (47) we have

$$\nabla_\mu T^{\nu\mu}_{\text{fluid}} = -\sum_a Q_a^\nu, \tag{49}$$

which expresses the four-momentum exchange between the fluid and the neutrinos.

To address the exchange of electron lepton number we must consider the number-conservative neutrino equation. We begin by defining a monochromatic number flux

$$\mathcal{N}^{\hat{\mu}}\left(x^\mu, \epsilon\right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int p^{\hat{\mu}}\, f\left(x^\mu, \epsilon, \Omega\right)\, d\Omega. \tag{50}$$

Inspection of Eqs. (12), (35) and (36) shows that it is related to the monochromatic stress energy and comoving moments by

$$\left(\mathcal{N}^{\hat{\mu}}\right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\mathcal{T}^{\hat{0}\hat{\mu}}\right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\mathcal{T}^{\hat{\mu}\hat{0}}\right) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{H}^{\hat{\imath}}\right)^T. \tag{51}$$

Following steps similar to those used to obtain Eqs. (40), (41), and (45), we integrate the number conservative Eq. (15) over $d\Omega$ and divide by ϵ to obtain

$$\mathsf{S}_N + \mathsf{M}_N = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int C[f]\, d\Omega, \tag{52}$$

where the spacetime divergence S_N and momentum space divergence M_N are given by

$$\mathsf{S}_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\left(\sqrt{-g}\, L^\mu{}_{\hat{\mu}}\, \mathcal{N}^{\hat{\mu}}\right), \tag{53}$$

$$\mathsf{M}_N = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\, \Gamma^{\hat{0}}_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}\, \mathcal{T}^{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}\right). \tag{54}$$

We define a monochromatic lepton number source r_a for neutrino species a from the right-hand side of Eq. (52):

$$r_a = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int C_a[f]\, d\Omega. \tag{55}$$

Integrating $\epsilon^2/(2\pi)^3$ times Eqs. (52)-(54) over neutrino energy ϵ for neutrino species a, we have

$$\nabla_\mu N_a^\mu = \int r_a\, \frac{\epsilon^2\, d\epsilon}{(2\pi)^3} \equiv R_a. \tag{56}$$

The divergence of the total electron lepton number vanishes:

$$\nabla_\mu \left(N_e^\mu + N_{\nu_e}^\mu - N_{\bar{\nu}_e}^\mu\right) = 0, \tag{57}$$

where N_e^μ is the net electron number flux vector of the fluid. By virtue of Eq. (56) we have

$$\nabla_\mu N_e^\mu = -R_{\nu_e} + R_{\bar{\nu}_e}, \tag{58}$$

which expresses electron lepton number exchange between the fluid and the neutrinos.

Moreover, the lepton number source on the right-hand side of Eq. (58) is intimately related to the four-momentum sources. Comparing Eqs. (55) and (46), we see that

$$r_a = \frac{1}{\epsilon} L^{\hat{0}}{}_\mu q_a^\mu \tag{59}$$

(note that $L^{\hat{0}}{}_\mu L^\mu{}_{\hat{\nu}} = \delta^{\hat{0}}{}_{\hat{\nu}}$).

The numerical consistency of a scheme in which the lepton number exchange is expressed in terms of the four-momentum exchange via Eq. (59)—which consistency presumably has consequences for simultaneous conservation of four-momentum and lepton number [36]—depends on the discretizations chosen for Eqs. (40), (41), and (45). (This is true regardless of whether the fluid/neutrino couplings are handled in an operator split fashion, e.g. Refs. [17, 18, 37]; or simultaneously with the solution of the transport equations in a single implicit solve, e.g. Refs. [36, 38].) To see this, note that the relation employed in Eq. (59) between the right-hand sides of the number and four-momentum equations should apply to the left-hand sides as well. In particular, the identity (see also Ref. [23])

$$\mathsf{S}_N + \mathsf{M}_N = \frac{1}{\epsilon} L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho} \left[(\mathsf{S}_T)^{\rho} + (\mathsf{M}_T)^{\rho} \right] \tag{60}$$

should hold for the discretized equations. Examining the first term on the right-hand side, we find using Eqs. (41) and (51) that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho} \left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^{\rho} = \mathsf{S}_N + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho} L^{\nu}{}_{\hat{\nu}} L^{\mu}{}_{\hat{\mu}} \Gamma^{\rho}_{\nu\mu} - L^{\rho}{}_{\hat{\nu}} L^{\mu}{}_{\hat{\mu}} \frac{\partial L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho}}{\partial x^{\mu}} \right) \mathcal{T}^{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}. \tag{61}$$

For the second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (60), we find using Eqs. (45) and (38) that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho} \left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^{\rho} = \mathsf{M}_N - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \Gamma^{\hat{0}}_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}} \mathcal{T}^{\hat{\nu}\hat{\mu}}. \tag{62}$$

Thus we see that in the sum of the above two equations, the ‘extra’ terms on the right do indeed cancel by virtue of Eq. (11). (Note that $L^{\rho}{}_{\hat{\nu}}\, \partial_{\mu} L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho} = -L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho}\, \partial_{\mu} L^{\rho}{}_{\hat{\nu}}$, thanks to $0 = \partial_{\mu}\left(\delta^{\hat{0}}{}_{\hat{\nu}}\right) = \partial_{\mu}\left(L^{\hat{0}}{}_{\rho} L^{\rho}{}_{\hat{\nu}}\right)$.) Ideally, the analytic steps confirming Eq. (60) can be followed in the discrete limit in order to find a discretization of Eqs. (40), (41), and (45) that is consistent with respect to both four-momentum and lepton number exchange.

III. SPECIALIZATION TO THE 3+1 METRIC

After briefly reviewing the 3+1 formulation of general relativity, we show how thinking in terms of three vectors—the four velocity n^u of Eulerian observers, the four-velocity u^{μ} of Lagrangian observers, and the (covariant) relative three-velocity v^{μ} that connects them—facilitates a full elaboration of the 3+1 variable Eddington tensor moment equations, including the detailed relationship between these and the number exchange equation.

A. Description and evolution of the geometry

Numerical relativity often is built upon the 3+1 formulation of general relativity. In this approach one considers a foliation of spacetime into spacelike slices, i.e. three-dimensional hypersurfaces Σ_t labeled by coordinate time t ($= x^0$ in our lab frame coordinate basis). The summary below serves to establish notation and spells out only the results we need here. Pedagogical introductions include Refs. [39–41].

Generic metric components in the 3+1 formulation are found from consideration of a ‘thin sandwich’ of spacetime bounded by two spacelike slices Σ_t and Σ_{t+dt}. In particular we consider the spacetime interval ds between two points: x^{μ} in Σ_t, and $x^{\mu}+dx^{\mu}$ in Σ_{t+dt}. With proper time interval $d\tau$ orthogonal to Σ_t, and proper length interval $d\ell$ tangent to Σ_t, ds is given by a Lorentzian version of the pythagorean theorem (note the signature -+++):

$$ds^2 = -d\tau^2 + d\ell^2. \tag{63}$$

Denote the orthogonal proper time at x^{μ} between Σ_t and Σ_{t+dt}

$$d\tau = \alpha\, dt, \tag{64}$$

and call α the lapse function. In considering the proper length $d\ell$ between x^{μ} in Σ_t and the orthogonal projection of $x^{\mu} + dx^{\mu}$ in Σ_{t+dt} onto Σ_t, we note that the curves $x^i =$ constant traced out by the spatial coordinates need not be orthogonal to Σ_t. That is, the spatial coordinates may be moving as seen by an observer at rest in Σ_t, such that they shift by a coordinate distance $\beta^i\, dt$ between Σ_t and Σ_{t+dt}. Allowing for such a shift vector β^i (which is tangent to Σ_t), and letting γ_{ij} denote the three-metric within Σ_t, we have

$$d\ell^2 = \gamma_{ij} \left(dx^i + \beta^i\, dt\right) \left(dx^j + \beta^j\, dt\right). \tag{65}$$

Comparing Eqs. (63)-(65) with the line element $ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}\, dx^{\mu}\, dx^{\nu}$, we read off the metric components

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha^2 + \beta_k \beta^k & \beta_j \\ \beta_i & \gamma_{ij} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{66}$$

The inverse metric is

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} -1/\alpha^2 & \beta_j/\alpha^2 \\ \beta_i/\alpha^2 & \gamma^{ij} - \beta^i \beta^j/\alpha^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{67}$$

The three-metric γ_{ij} and its inverse γ^{ij} lower and raise the indices of three-vectors within (tangent to) the spacelike slice, as in $\beta_i = \gamma_{ij}\beta^j$ and $\beta^i = \gamma^{ij}\beta_j$. Finally,

$$\sqrt{-g} = \alpha\sqrt{\gamma} \tag{68}$$

expresses the determinant g of the four-metric in terms of the lapse function and the determinant γ of the three-metric.

Solution of the Einstein equations for the metric components—nonlinear partial differential equations, second order in space and time—constitutes knowledge of spacetime. In the 3+1 approach, solution of the Einstein equations is transformed into a Cauchy problem: specify initial data (satisfying certain constraints from the Einstein equations) on an initial spacelike slice; and with coordinate freedom fixed and spatial boundary conditions specified, evolve the geometry of the spacelike slices forward in time. Of the ten degrees of freedom associated with the metric components (the number of independent elements in a 4×4 symmetric matrix), four correspond to the freedom in general relativity to choose any spacetime coordinates whatsoever, leaving six physical degrees of freedom to be determined. The standard way to think about the coordinate freedom in the 3+1 approach is to regard the lapse function α and shift vector β^i as freely specifiable functions in time and space, associated respectively with the choice of time coordinate (i.e. the foliation or spacetime slicing) and the choice of spatial coordinates (in particular the motion of these coordinates as seen by an observer at rest in a slice). In order to facilitate practical solution by forward evolution in time, the second-order-in-time system is transformed to double the number of equations, first order in time, for double the number of dynamical variables. In particular, the above phrase "evolve the geometry of the spacelike slices forward in time" corresponds to evolution of (a) the six independent components of the three-metric γ_{ij} governing the geometry within a slice, and (b) the six independent components of the extrinsic curvature K_{ij} (another symmetric tensor tangent to the spacelike slice) that describes the warp of the spacelike slices as embedded in spacetime. Here we do not show these evolution equations; in what follows, we simply regard γ_{ij} and K_{ij} as given, for instance as having been obtained by numerical solution (often of even further transformed systems, as for instance in BSSN and related approaches); see e.g. Refs. [41–43].

B. Four-velocity of Eulerian observers and the spacetime divergence

In dealing with various forms of stress energy and the equations that govern them in the 3+1 context, two helpful tensors are the unit normal n^μ and the orthogonal projector $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$. The unit normal n^μ to a spacelike slice at a given point can be regarded as the four-velocity of an Eulerian observer, i.e. one at rest in the lab frame. In the lab frame coordinate basis its components are

$$(n^\mu) = (1/\alpha, -\beta^i/\alpha)^T, \tag{69}$$

$$(n_\mu) = (-\alpha, 0, 0, 0). \tag{70}$$

Note that indeed $n_\mu n^\mu = g_{\mu\nu} n^\mu n^\nu = -1$ as expected of a unit vector. The orthogonal projector is

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu. \tag{71}$$

From Eqs. (66) and (70) it follows that the spatial part of $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ equals the three-metric γ_{ij}, motivating use of the same base symbol. While contraction of an arbitrary vector with n^μ yields the portion orthogonal to a spacelike slice, contraction with $\gamma_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu$ yields the portion tangent to the spacelike slice. Indeed a trivial calculation confirms that $\gamma_{\mu\nu} n^\nu = 0$.

The unit normal and orthogonal projector can be used to decompose a stress-energy tensor $T^{\mu\nu}$. The 'Eulerian projections'

$$E = n_\mu n_\nu T^{\mu\nu}, \tag{72}$$

$$F^\mu = -n_\nu \gamma^\mu{}_\rho T^{\nu\rho}, \tag{73}$$

$$S^{\mu\nu} = \gamma^\mu{}_\rho \gamma^\nu{}_\sigma T^{\rho\sigma} \tag{74}$$

are respectively the energy density, momentum density (or energy flux), and stress measured by an Eulerian observer. The momentum density and stress are spacelike, i.e. tangent to the spacelike slice:

$$n_\mu F^\mu = 0, \tag{75}$$

$$n_\mu S^{\mu\nu} = n_\nu S^{\mu\nu} = 0. \tag{76}$$

In terms of Eqs. (72)-(74), a stress-energy tensor can be decomposed as

$$T^{\mu\nu} = E\, n^\mu n^\nu + F^\mu n^\nu + F^\nu n^\mu + S^{\mu\nu}. \tag{77}$$

We call this the 'Eulerian decomposition' of $T^{\mu\nu}$. Emphasizing the spacelike character of F^μ and $S^{\mu\nu}$ (see Eqs. (75) and (76)), it can be re-expressed

$$T^{\mu\nu} = E\, n^\mu n^\nu + F^i \gamma^\mu{}_i n^\nu + F^i \gamma^\nu{}_i n^\mu + S^{ij} \gamma^\mu{}_i \gamma^\nu{}_j \tag{78}$$

in the lab frame coordinate basis.

Turning from a generic stress-energy tensor to the neutrino radiation in particular, we similarly define the Eulerian projections and Eulerian decomposition of the monochromatic neutrino stress-energy

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu} = L^\mu{}_{\hat\mu} L^\nu{}_{\hat\nu}\, \mathcal{T}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}, \tag{79}$$

whose comoving frame components $\mathcal{T}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}$ were given in Eqs. (35) and (36). The coordinate transformation $L^\mu{}_{\hat\mu}$ from the orthonormal comoving frame to the lab frame coordinate basis was discussed in Sec. II A. The Eulerian projections

$$\mathcal{E} = n_\mu n_\nu \mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}, \tag{80}$$

$$\mathcal{F}^\mu = -n_\nu \gamma^\mu{}_\rho \mathcal{T}^{\nu\rho}, \tag{81}$$

$$\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} = \gamma^\mu{}_\rho \gamma^\nu{}_\sigma \mathcal{T}^{\rho\sigma} \tag{82}$$

are respectively the monochromatic neutrino energy density, momentum density, and stress as measured by an Eulerian observer. The momentum density and stress are spacelike,

$$n_\mu \mathcal{F}^\mu = 0, \tag{83}$$

$$n_\mu \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} = n_\nu \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{84}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{E}\, n^\mu n^\nu + \mathcal{F}^\mu n^\nu + \mathcal{F}^\nu n^\mu + \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} \tag{85}$$

is the Eulerian decomposition of the monochromatic stress-energy.

The results in Appendix A for the four components of the spacetime divergence $\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu}$ of a stress-energy tensor can be adapted immediately to the spacetime divergence $(\mathsf{S}_T)^\nu$ of the monochromatic particle stress-energy in Eq. (41). In particular we make the formal replacements

$$T^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}, \tag{86}$$

$$E \rightarrow \mathcal{E}, \tag{87}$$

$$F^\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^\mu, \tag{88}$$

$$S^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}. \tag{89}$$

From Eq. (A14), the projection of the spacetime divergence orthogonal to the spacelike slice—which contributes to the neutrino energy equation—is

$$-\, n_\nu \left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu = \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \left[\frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{D}_{T,n}\right)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{F}_{T,n}\right)^i}{\partial x^i} - \mathsf{G}_{T,n} \right], \tag{90}$$

where

$$\mathsf{D}_{T,n} = \sqrt{\gamma}\mathcal{E}, \tag{91}$$

$$\left(\mathsf{F}_{T,n}\right)^i = \sqrt{\gamma}\left(\alpha\mathcal{F}^i - \beta^i\mathcal{E}\right), \tag{92}$$

$$\mathsf{G}_{T,n} = -\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\frac{\mathcal{F}^i}{\alpha}\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x^i} - \mathcal{S}^{ij}K_{ij}\right) \tag{93}$$

are respectively the 'conserved' energy density, energy flux, and gravitational power associated with the neutrinos. From Eq. (A31), the projection of the spacetime divergence orthogonal to the spacelike slice—which contributes to the neutrino momentum equation—is

$$\gamma_{j\nu}\left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu = \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \left[\frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{D}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{F}_{T,\gamma}\right)^i{}_j}{\partial x^i} - \left(\mathsf{G}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j \right], \tag{94}$$

where

$$\left(\mathsf{D}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j = \sqrt{\gamma}\mathcal{F}_j, \tag{95}$$

$$\left(\mathsf{F}_{T,\gamma}\right)^i{}_j = \sqrt{\gamma}\left(\alpha\mathcal{S}^i{}_j - \beta^i\mathcal{F}_j\right), \tag{96}$$

$$\left(\mathsf{G}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j = -\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\frac{\mathcal{E}}{\alpha}\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x^j} - \mathcal{F}_i\frac{\partial\beta^i}{\partial x^j} - \frac{\mathcal{S}^{ik}}{2}\frac{\partial\gamma_{ik}}{\partial x^j}\right) \tag{97}$$

are respectively the 'conserved' momentum density, momentum flux, and gravitational force associated with the neutrinos. Note that $\mathcal{E}\left(x^\rho, \epsilon\right)$, $\mathcal{F}^\mu\left(x^\rho, \epsilon\right)$, and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}\left(x^\rho, \epsilon\right)$ are functions of the lab frame spacetime coordinates x^ρ and the neutrino energy ϵ reckoned in a comoving frame. Their relations to the primitive variables $\mathcal{J}\left(x^\rho, \epsilon\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{\imath}}\left(x^\rho, \epsilon\right)$ follow from Eqs. (80)-(82), (79), (7), and (36); but see also the following two subsections and Appendix B. The projections of the spacetime divergence presented here are in accord with the corresponding terms in Eqs. (3.37) and (3.38) of Shibata et al. [20].

C. Four-velocity of Lagrangian observers and the momentum space divergence

Before turning to the momentum space divergence, it will be helpful to begin rewriting in covariant form some of the expressions we have given involving comoving frame components, by writing them in terms of the four-velocity u^μ of Lagrangian observers (i.e. those at rest with respect to the fluid). In an orthonormal comoving frame we have

$$\left(u^{\hat{\mu}}\right) = (1, 0, 0, 0)^T, \tag{98}$$

$$\left(u_{\hat{\mu}}\right) = (-1, 0, 0, 0). \tag{99}$$

Thus for example

$$\epsilon = -u_{\hat{0}}p^{\hat{0}} = -u_{\hat{\mu}}p^{\hat{\mu}} = -u_\mu p^\mu \tag{100}$$

is the neutrino energy measured by a Lagrangian observer, expressed in terms of lab frame coordinate basis components $u_\mu = u_{\hat{\mu}} L^{\hat{\mu}}{}_\mu$ and $p^\mu = L^\mu{}_{\hat{\mu}} p^{\hat{\mu}}$ (the coordinate transformation $L^\mu{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ from the orthonormal comoving frame to the lab frame coordinate basis, and its inverse $L^{\hat{\mu}}{}_\mu$, were discussed in Sec. II A).

Turning to the comoving frame angular moments $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{\imath}}$, and $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}}$ defined in Eqs. (27)-(30), we can define covariant versions by extending $\ell^{\hat{\imath}}$ to a unit four-vector ℓ^μ satisfying $\ell_\mu \ell^\mu = 1$. This vector is spacelike in the comoving frame, with comoving frame components $\left(\ell^{\hat{\mu}}\right) = (0, \ell^{\hat{1}}, \ell^{\hat{2}}, \ell^{\hat{3}})^T$, and is thus orthogonal to u^μ, i.e.

$$u_\mu \ell^\mu = 0 \tag{101}$$

in any basis. Thus $\epsilon\,\ell^\mu$ is a covariant representation of the three-momentum measured by a Lagrangian observer. Covariant representations of the comoving frame angular moments are

$$\mathcal{J} = \epsilon \int f\, d\Omega, \tag{102}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^\mu = \epsilon \int \ell^\mu\, f\, d\Omega, \tag{103}$$

$$\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon \int \ell^\mu \ell^\nu\, f\, d\Omega, \tag{104}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho} = \epsilon \int \ell^\mu \ell^\nu \ell^\rho\, f\, d\Omega, \tag{105}$$

where the integration is still performed with respect to the comoving frame solid angle.

While in Eqs. (31)-(34) we nominally defined closure of the system in terms of the comoving frame components $\mathcal{K}^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\hat{\imath}\hat{\jmath}\hat{k}}$ of the second and third angular moments, in practice we may be able to obtain the lab frame coordinate basis components $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ without ever explicitly transforming any of the moments to and/or from the comoving frame using the transformations $L^{\hat{\mu}}{}_\mu$ and $L^\mu{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ discussed in Sec. II A. (Applying the closures without any reference to comoving frame components is desirable because it would be a hassle to have to work explicitly with the transformations $L^{\hat\mu}{}_{\mu}$ and $L^{\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}$. These will be quite complicated in the general multidimensional case, because neither the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, nor therefore the tetrad $e^{\mu}{}_{\bar\mu}$, nor either the boost $\Lambda^{\bar\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}$, will be diagonal. Moreover, it would be necessary to apply the tetrad to the coordinate basis velocity variables obtained with the hydrodynamics solver in order to get the velocity parameters appearing in the boost. Working only with lab frame coordinate basis components of the comoving frame angular moments avoids these complications.) Following Ref. [44], we note that if $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ is regarded as a function of the zeroth and first moments $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\mu}$, the most general symmetric expression that (a) is spacelike relative to u^{μ}, and (b) satisfies the trace condition $\mathcal{K}^{\mu}{}_{\mu} = \mathcal{J}$ (obvious from Eqs. (102) and (104)), is of the form

$$\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{J} h^{\mu\nu} + a(\mathcal{J},\mathcal{H})\left(\mathcal{H}^{\mu}\mathcal{H}^{\nu} - \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{H}^{2} h^{\mu\nu}\right), \quad (106)$$

where $\mathcal{H} = \sqrt{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}\mathcal{H}^{\mu}}$, and

$$h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + u_{\mu}u_{\nu} \quad (107)$$

is the orthogonal projector relative to u^{μ}. We extend this thinking to the third moment, finding the unique expression

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho} = {} & \frac{1}{5}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\mu}h^{\nu\rho} + \mathcal{H}^{\rho}h^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{H}^{\nu}h^{\rho\mu}\right) \\ & + b(\mathcal{J},\mathcal{H})\Big[\mathcal{H}^{\mu}\mathcal{H}^{\nu}\mathcal{H}^{\rho} \\ & - \frac{1}{5}\mathcal{H}^{2}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\mu}h^{\nu\rho} + \mathcal{H}^{\rho}h^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{H}^{\nu}h^{\rho\mu}\right)\Big] \quad (108)\end{aligned}$$

satisfying the trace conditions (obvious from Eqs. (103) and (105))

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mu}{}_{\mu}{}^{\rho} = \mathcal{H}^{\rho}, \quad \mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu}{}_{\mu} = \mathcal{H}^{\nu}, \quad \mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu}{}_{\nu} = \mathcal{H}^{\mu}. \quad (109)$$

The point is that when $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ are obtained only from knowledge of $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\mu}$, in principle the only freedom in the closures are the scalar functions $a(\mathcal{J},\mathcal{H})$ and $b(\mathcal{J},\mathcal{H})$, in which the magnitude $\mathcal{H} = \sqrt{\mathcal{H}_{\mu}\mathcal{H}^{\mu}}$ can be evaluated in terms of lab frame coordinate basis components.

Consider next the monochromatic stress energy $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$. As can be confirmed in the comoving frame, the neutrino momentum p^{μ} can be covariantly decomposed as

$$p^{\mu} = \epsilon\left(u^{\mu} + \ell^{\mu}\right), \quad (110)$$

i.e. into portions tangent and orthogonal to the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u^{μ}. Using this in the monochromatic stress energy

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int p^{\mu}p^{\nu}\, f\, d\Omega \quad (111)$$

(see Eqs. (35) and (79)), one can see that the 'Lagrangian projections'

$$\mathcal{J} = u_{\mu}u_{\nu}\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (112)$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{\mu} = -u_{\nu}h^{\mu}{}_{\rho}\mathcal{T}^{\nu\rho}, \quad (113)$$

$$\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} = h^{\mu}{}_{\rho}h^{\nu}{}_{\sigma}\mathcal{T}^{\rho\sigma}, \quad (114)$$

do in fact yield Eqs. (102)-(104). (Recall that $h_{\mu\nu}$, given by Eq. (107), is the orthogonal projector relative to u^{μ}.) Thus the moments $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\mu}$, and $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ are respectively the monochromatic neutrino energy density, momentum density, and stress measured by a Lagrangian observer. Note that $\mathcal{H}^{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ are spacelike in the comoving frame:

$$u_{\mu}\mathcal{H}^{\mu} = 0, \quad (115)$$

$$u_{\mu}\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} = u_{\nu}\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (116)$$

Therefore $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ can be written as the 'Lagrangian decomposition'

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{J}\, u^{\mu}u^{\nu} + \mathcal{H}^{\mu}u^{\nu} + \mathcal{H}^{\nu}u^{\mu} + \mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (117)$$

which provides an alternative to the Eulerian decomposition of Eq. (85) in terms of the energy density, momentum density, and stress measured by an Eulerian observer.

Eqs. (85) and (117) can be used to write the monochromatic energy density, momentum density, and stress measured by an Eulerian observer ($\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}^{\mu}$, and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$) in terms of their counterparts measured by a Lagrangian observer ($\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\mu}$, and $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$), and vice-versa. In one direction, use Eqs. (80)-(82) and substitute Eq. (117) on the right-hand side. In the other direction, use Eqs. (112)-(114) and substitute Eq. (85) on the right-hand side. We will say more about this in the next subsection and in Appendix B.

Next we turn to the third momentum moment $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\mu\nu}$, given by

$$\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int p^{\mu}p^{\nu}p^{\rho}\, f\, d\Omega \quad (118)$$

(see Eq. (37)). Note that

$$-u_{\rho}\mathcal{U}^{\rho\mu\nu} = -u_{\rho}\mathcal{U}^{\mu\rho\nu} = -u_{\rho}\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho} = \epsilon\,\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu} \quad (119)$$

is a covariant version of Eq. (38). Using Eq. (110) in Eq. (118) and comparing with Eqs. (102)-(105), we find

$$\epsilon\,\mathcal{J} = -u_{\mu}u_{\nu}u_{\rho}\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}, \quad (120)$$

$$\epsilon\,\mathcal{H}^{\mu} = u_{\nu}u_{\rho}h^{\mu}{}_{\sigma}\mathcal{U}^{\nu\rho\sigma}, \quad (121)$$

$$\epsilon\,\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} = -u_{\rho}h^{\mu}{}_{\sigma}h^{\nu}{}_{\kappa}\mathcal{U}^{\rho\sigma\kappa}, \quad (122)$$

$$\epsilon\,\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho} = h^{\mu}{}_{\sigma}h^{\nu}{}_{\kappa}h^{\rho}{}_{\lambda}\mathcal{U}^{\sigma\kappa\lambda} \quad (123)$$

for the Lagrangian projections of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$. The associated Lagrangian decomposition is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho} = \epsilon\,(&\mathcal{J}u^{\mu}u^{\nu}u^{\rho} + \mathcal{H}^{\mu}u^{\nu}u^{\rho} + \mathcal{H}^{\nu}u^{\mu}u^{\rho} + \mathcal{H}^{\rho}u^{\mu}u^{\nu} \\ &+ \mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}u^{\rho} + \mathcal{K}^{\mu\rho}u^{\nu} + \mathcal{K}^{\rho\nu}u^{\mu} + \mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}). \quad (124)\end{aligned}$$

Eqs. (119) and (124) are special to contraction and decomposition respectively with respect to the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u^{μ}. That is, the identity (up to a factor ϵ) of the Lagrangian projections $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^{\mu}$, and $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ with the Lagrangian projections of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ (except of course for the irreducible $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}$) holds due to our choice to measure energies and define angular moments in the comoving frame. We can define (and in fact will use) the Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$,

$$\mathcal{Z} = -n_\mu n_\nu n_\rho \mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}, \tag{125}$$

$$\mathcal{Y}^\mu = n_\nu n_\rho \gamma^\mu{}_\sigma \mathcal{U}^{\nu\rho\sigma}, \tag{126}$$

$$\mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu} = -n_\rho \gamma^\mu{}_\sigma \gamma^\nu{}_\kappa \mathcal{U}^{\rho\sigma\kappa}, \tag{127}$$

$$\mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho} = \gamma^\mu{}_\sigma \gamma^\nu{}_\kappa \gamma^\rho{}_\lambda \mathcal{U}^{\sigma\kappa\lambda}, \tag{128}$$

and construct the associated Eulerian decomposition of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho} = {} & \mathcal{Z} n^\mu n^\nu n^\rho + \mathcal{Y}^\mu n^\nu n^\rho + \mathcal{Y}^\nu n^\mu n^\rho + \mathcal{Y}^\rho n^\mu n^\nu \\ & + \mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu} n^\rho + \mathcal{X}^{\mu\rho} n^\nu + \mathcal{X}^{\rho\nu} n^\mu + \mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}.\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

The relationships between the Eulerian projections $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{Y}^\mu$, $\mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ and the Eulerian projections $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ are not as simple as the relationships between the coefficients of Eqs. (117) and (124). Nevertheless, useful relationships between the Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ do exist and will be presented in the next subsection.

In a different vein, another comoving frame expression that can be written in covariant form thanks to Eq. (99) is

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{\hat 0}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu} &= -\Gamma^{\hat 0}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu} u_{\hat 0} = -\Gamma^{\hat\rho}_{\hat\nu\hat\mu} u_{\hat\rho} = \nabla_{\hat\mu} u_{\hat\nu} - \partial_{\hat\mu} u_{\hat\nu} \\ &= \nabla_{\hat\mu} u_{\hat\nu},\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

a covariant expression for the connection coefficients appearing in Eq. (45).

Having obtained these expressions rewritten covariantly in terms of the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u^μ, we are ready to consider the momentum space divergence. Using Eq. (130), the angle-integrated momentum space divergence of Eq. (45) can be written

$$(\mathsf{M}_T)^\rho = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\, L^\rho{}_{\hat\rho}\, \mathcal{U}^{\hat\rho\hat\nu\hat\mu} \nabla_{\hat\mu} u_{\hat\nu}\right), \tag{131}$$

or, taking advantage of the covariant nature of this expression,

$$(\mathsf{M}_T)^\rho = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\, \mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu} \nabla_\mu u_\nu\right), \tag{132}$$

where $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ is given by Eqs. (124) or (129). Projecting orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice, we have

$$-\,n_\rho\, (\mathsf{M}_T)^\rho = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(\epsilon^2\, n_\rho \mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu} \nabla_\mu u_\nu\right), \tag{133}$$

$$\gamma_{j\rho}\, (\mathsf{M}_T)^\rho = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\, \gamma_{j\rho} \mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu} \nabla_\mu u_\nu\right). \tag{134}$$

Up to multiplicative factors of ϵ in defining the moments, the projections of the momentum space divergence (i.e. energy derivative) presented here are in accord with the corresponding terms in Eqs. (3.37) and (3.38) of Shibata et al. [20].

D. Three-velocity of Lagrangian observers and the relation between the lab and comoving frames

In Section II we obtained expressions in terms of lab frame coordinate basis spacetime position components x^μ and comoving frame orthonormal basis momentum components $p^{\hat\imath}$ through application of coordinate transformations $L^\mu{}_{\hat\mu}$, but in the context of the 3+1 formulation there is a more fruitful way of expressing the relationship between the lab and comoving frames. In particular the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u^μ (i.e. the four-velocity of the fluid) can be 'Eulerian decomposed' into parts orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice, that is to say, parts tangent and orthogonal to the Eulerian observer four-velocity n^μ:

$$u^\mu = \Lambda\left(n^\mu + v^\mu\right). \tag{135}$$

The orthogonality requirement on v^μ,

$$n_\mu v^\mu = 0, \tag{136}$$

implies (see Eq. (70)) that v^μ is spacelike and has components

$$\left(v^\mu\right) = \left(0, v^i\right)^T \tag{137}$$

in the lab frame coordinate basis. The interpretation of v^μ as the three-velocity of a Lagrangian observer as measured by an Eulerian observer is confirmed by squaring Eq. (135) to find the expected Lorentz factor

$$\Lambda = \left(1 - v^\mu v_\mu\right)^{-1/2} = \left(1 - v^i v_i\right)^{-1/2} \tag{138}$$

for a boost between frames with relative three-velocity v^μ. (Recall that $u_\mu u^\mu = n_\mu n^\mu = -1$. The scalar Lorentz factor Λ lacks indices and will not be confused with the Lorentz boost $\Lambda^{\bar\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}$.)

In the previous subsection we discussed finding the monochromatic energy density, momentum density, and stress measured by an Eulerian observer ($\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$) in terms of their counterparts measured by a Lagrangian observer ($\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$). In substituting the Lagrangian decomposition of Eq. (117) in Eqs. (80)-(82), the factors of n_μ and $\gamma^\mu{}_\nu$ can be expressed in terms of u_μ and v_μ via Eq. (135). Using also Eqs. (115) and (116), this provides an alternate route to the relations obtained more tediously from the transformation $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu} = L^\mu{}_{\hat\mu} L^\nu{}_{\hat\nu} \mathcal{T}^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}$ and Eq. (36). The explicit results are analogous to those obtained [27] via Lorentz transformations in special relativity. They are not particularly illuminating, but for completeness we exhibit them in Appendix B. Relations between $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^\mu$, $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ will of course be needed in numerical work, but it may be best to perform the contractions in Eqs. (80)-(82) numerically rather than code the tedious analytic expressions in Appendix B.

We also use Eqs. (135) and (136) in fulfilling our promise, made in the previous subsection, to relate the

Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ in Eq. (129) to those of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (85). These relations are obtained by plugging Eq. (129) into Eq. (119) and comparing the results with Eq. (85) for the coefficients of outer products of two, one, and zero copies of n^μ. The results are

$$\Lambda\left(\mathcal{Z} - v_\mu \mathcal{Y}^\mu\right) = \epsilon\, \mathcal{E}, \tag{139}$$

$$\Lambda\left(\mathcal{Y}^\mu - v_\nu \mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu}\right) = \epsilon\, \mathcal{F}^\mu, \tag{140}$$

$$\Lambda\left(\mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu} - v_\rho \mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}\right) = \epsilon\, \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}. \tag{141}$$

These can be 'unraveled' in reverse order to give

$$\Lambda\, \mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon\, \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda v_\rho \mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}, \tag{142}$$

$$\Lambda\, \mathcal{Y}^{\mu} = \epsilon\, \mathcal{F}^{\mu} + v_\nu\left(\epsilon\, \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda v_\rho \mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}\right), \tag{143}$$

$$\Lambda\, \mathcal{Z} = \epsilon\, \mathcal{E} + v_\mu\left[\epsilon\, \mathcal{F}^{\mu} + v_\nu\left(\epsilon\, \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda v_\rho \mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}\right)\right]. \tag{144}$$

We discussed finding the Eulerian projections $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ in terms of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ (i.e. the comoving frame angular moments) in the previous paragraph; see also Appendix B. There remains the third moment $\mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}$, which can be found in terms of $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^\mu$, $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ through the projection

$$\mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho} = \gamma^\mu{}_\sigma \gamma^\nu{}_\kappa \gamma^\rho{}_\lambda \mathcal{U}^{\sigma\kappa\lambda}, \tag{145}$$

using the Lagrangian decomposition of Eq. (124) on the right-hand side. Indeed this same approach can be used in lieu of Eqs. (142)-(144) to directly obtain $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{Y}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu}$ in terms of $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^\mu$, $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ as well. Again we reserve explicit expressions for Appendix B.

These Eulerian projections come into play in making the momentum space divergence more explicit, for we use the Eulerian decomposition of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ given by Eq. (129) and the Eulerian decomposition of u_ν given by Eq. (135) in expanding the expression $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}\nabla_\mu u_\nu$ appearing in Eqs. (133) and (134). At first glance the use of these Eulerian decompositions may seem to complicate things. With our choice to measure neutrino momentum components and define angular moments in the comoving frame, the Lagrangian decomposition of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ in Eq. (124) is simpler in the sense described in Section III C, and indeed u_ν is the four-velocity of Lagrangian observers; so why not stay with these Lagrangian expressions? The problem is that we cannot stay in 'Lagrangian world'—in the comoving frame—altogether, much as we might like to, because the covariant derivative $\nabla_\mu u_\nu$ is with respect to the lab frame coordinate basis. We have swept the connection coefficients in Eq. (45) temporarily under the rug via Eq. (130), but lab frame coordinate basis connection coefficients still lurk in the covariant derivative $\nabla_\mu u_\nu$.

Given the unavoidable necessity of facing the relation between the lab and comoving frames in one way or another, there are significant advantages to consistent use of Eulerian decompositions, in which the relation between frames is focused more in the three-velocity v^μ of a Lagrangian observer as measured by an Eulerian observer, than in the coordinate transformations $L^\mu{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ of Eq. (7).

If we stay with Eq. (45), we face the unpleasant prospect of evaluating Eq. (11) for the transformed connection coefficients. Even rewritten as Eq. (132), we face lab frame coordinate basis connection coefficients when using the Lagrangian decomposition of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ and leaving the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u_ν as is. But as derivations in Appendices A and C show, the fact that Eulerian decompositions are most natural in the 3+1 approach allows us to almost completely avoid explicit encounters with connection coefficients.

Moreover, consistent use of the Eulerian perspective—both in projecting out the portions of the phase space divergence orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice, and in Eulerian decompositions of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ and u_ν—also turns out to preclude any appearance of time derivatives of metric functions, even in intermediate steps. Time derivatives of the lapse function α and shift vector β^i would be particularly inconvenient in numerical work, as these do not normally have evolution equations associated with them. (Unfortunately, we shall see that time derivatives of the Lorentz factor Λ and three-velocity v^i remain; these are something of a nuisance, but at least in principle they could be written in terms of spatial derivatives via hydrodynamics evolution equations.)

Finally, the Eulerian decomposition of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ is more readily tied to the Eulerian decomposition of $\mathcal{T}^{\nu\mu}$, i.e. to the energy density $\mathcal{E}$, momentum density $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and stress $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ measured by an Eulerian observer. This is advantageous in relating four-momentum conservation to lepton number conservation, for cancellations must occur between the spacetime and momentum space divergences, and it is $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ that appear in the spacetime divergence in Eqs. (90) and (94).

Details of the calculation of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}\nabla_\mu u_\nu$, using the Eulerian decompositions of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ and $\nabla_\mu u_\nu$, are given in Appendix C. Using those results for the projection orthogonal to the spacelike slice, we have

$$-\,n_\nu\left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\nu = \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}}\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left[\epsilon^2\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,n} + \mathsf{O}_{T,n}\right)\right], \tag{146}$$

where

$$\mathsf{R}_{T,n} = -\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\,\Lambda\left[\frac{\left(\mathcal{Z}v^i - \mathcal{Y}^i\right)}{\alpha}\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x^i} - \mathcal{Y}_k v^i\frac{\partial\beta^k}{\partial x^i} - \mathcal{X}^{ki}v^m\frac{\partial\gamma_{ki}}{\partial x^m} + \mathcal{X}^{ki}K_{ki}\right], \tag{147}$$

$$\mathsf{O}_{T,n} = -\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\left[\mathcal{Z}n^\mu\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial x^\mu} + \mathcal{Y}^i\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial x^i} - \mathcal{Y}_k n^\mu\frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^\mu} - \mathcal{X}_k{}^i\frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^i}\right], \tag{148}$$

arise from changes in the neutrino energy as measured in the comoving frame due to gravitational redshift ($\mathsf{R}_{T,n}$) and the acceleration of the observer riding along with the fluid ($\mathsf{O}_{T,n}$). Similarly,

$$\gamma_{j\nu}\left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\nu = \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}}\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left\{\epsilon^2\left[\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j + \left(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j\right]\right\}, \tag{149}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j = &-\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\,\Lambda\left[\frac{\left(\mathcal{Y}_j v^i - \mathcal{X}_j{}^i\right)}{\alpha}\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x^i} - \mathcal{X}_{jk}v^i\frac{\partial\beta^k}{\partial x^i}\right. \\ &\left.-\mathcal{W}_j{}^{ki}v^m\frac{\partial\gamma_{ki}}{\partial x^m} + \mathcal{W}_j{}^{ki}K_{ki}\right], \end{aligned}\tag{150}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j = &-\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\left[\mathcal{Y}_j n^\mu\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial x^\mu} + \mathcal{X}_j{}^i\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial x^i}\right. \\ &\left.-\mathcal{X}_{jk}n^\mu\frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^\mu} - \mathcal{W}_{jk}{}^i\frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^i}\right]\end{aligned}\tag{151}$$

for the projection of the momentum space divergence tangent to the spacelike slice. That the structures of $\mathsf{R}_{T,n}$ and $\mathsf{O}_{T,n}$ parallel those of $\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j$ and $\left(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j$ is simply a reflection of the parallel structure of Eqs. (C3) and (C4). As given here they are expressed in terms of the Eulerian projections $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{Y}^\mu$, $\mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ (see Eq. (129)). In numerical work these could be further expressed in terms of the Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{T}^{\nu\mu}$ (see Eq. (85)), i.e. the energy density $\mathcal{E}$, momentum density $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and stress $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ measured by an Eulerian observer, via Eqs. (142)-(144). They could also be expressed directly in terms of the Lagrangian projections, as shown in Appendix B.

E. Four-momentum and lepton number exchange

The relationship of lepton number and energy exchange at a high level is readily seen. Revisiting Section II D in terms of covariant expressions involving the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u^μ (see Section III C), it is easy to see that Eq. (51) becomes

$$\mathcal{N}^\mu = -\frac{1}{\epsilon}u_\nu\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}, \tag{152}$$

that Eq. (54) becomes

$$\mathsf{M}_N = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\,\mathcal{T}^{\nu\mu}\nabla_\mu u_\nu\right), \tag{153}$$

and that Eq. (60) becomes

$$\mathsf{S}_N + \mathsf{M}_N = -\frac{1}{\epsilon}u_\nu\left[\left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu + \left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\nu\right]. \tag{154}$$

The first term on the right-hand side is

$$-\frac{1}{\epsilon}u_\nu\left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu = -\frac{1}{\epsilon}u_\nu\nabla_\mu\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu} \tag{155}$$

$$= \nabla_\mu\left(-\frac{1}{\epsilon}u_\nu\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}\right) + \frac{\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}}{\epsilon}\nabla_\mu u_\nu \tag{156}$$

$$= \mathsf{S}_N + \frac{\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}}{\epsilon}\nabla_\mu u_\nu, \tag{157}$$

thanks to Eq. (152). The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (154) is

$$-\frac{1}{\epsilon}u_\rho\left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\rho = -\frac{1}{\epsilon}u_\rho\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\,\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}\nabla_\mu u_\nu\right)\right] \tag{158}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&= \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\epsilon^2\,\mathcal{T}^{\nu\mu}\nabla_\mu u_\nu\right) \\ &\quad-\epsilon\,\mathcal{T}^{\nu\mu}\nabla_\mu u_\nu\frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon}\left(-\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{159}$$

$$= \mathsf{M}_N - \frac{\mathcal{T}^{\nu\mu}}{\epsilon}\nabla_\mu u_\nu, \tag{160}$$

by virtue of Eqs. (119) and (153). The sum of Eqs. (157) and (160) gives Eq. (154) as required.

This consistency between lepton number and energy exchange applies not only at this high level, but also to the detailed form of the moment equations as we have most expressly written them, which has implications for their discretization. In terms of the decomposition of u^μ in Eq. (135), we have

$$\mathsf{S}_N + \mathsf{M}_N = -\frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon}\left(n_\nu + v_\nu\right)\left[\left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu + \left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\nu\right] \tag{161}$$

for Eq. (154). This is, naturally, closely related to our projections of the spacetime and momentum space divergences orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice.

We consider first the spacetime divergence on the right-hand side of Eq. (161). Using Eqs. (90)-(92) and (69), we have

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon}n_\nu\left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu = &\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left[\frac{\Lambda\left(\mathsf{D}_{T,n}\right)}{\epsilon}\right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\left[\frac{\Lambda\left(\mathsf{F}_{T,n}\right)^i}{\epsilon}\right]\right. \\ &\left.-\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left[\Lambda\left(\mathsf{G}_{T,n}\right) + \mathsf{E}_{T,n}\right]\right\}\frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}},\end{aligned} \tag{162}$$

where

$$\mathsf{E}_{T,n} = \alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\mathcal{E}n^\mu\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial x^\mu} + \mathcal{X}^i\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial x^i}\right) \tag{163}$$

are the ‘extra’ terms that arise from pulling the factor Λ inside the time and space derivatives. Thus the discretized form of $\mathsf{E}_{T,n}$ will be dictated by the discretization chosen for the first two terms of Eq. (90). Similarly, using Eqs. (94)-(96) and (69), we have

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{\Lambda v^j}{\epsilon}\gamma_{j\nu}\left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu = &\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left[\frac{\Lambda v^j\left(\mathsf{D}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j}{\epsilon}\right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\left[\frac{\Lambda v^j\left(\mathsf{F}_{T,\gamma}\right)^i{}_j}{\epsilon}\right]\right. \\ &\left.-\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left[\Lambda v^j\left(\mathsf{G}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j + \mathsf{E}_{T,\gamma}\right]\right\}\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{164}$$

where

$$\mathsf{E}_{T,\gamma} = \alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\left[\mathcal{F}_j n^\mu\frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^j\right)}{\partial x^\mu} + \mathcal{S}^i{}_j\frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^j\right)}{\partial x^i}\right] \tag{165}$$

are the 'extra' terms that arise from pulling the factor Λv^j inside the time and space derivatives. Thus the discretized form of $\mathsf{E}_{T,\gamma}$ will be dictated by the discretization chosen for the first two terms of Eq. (94). Adding Eqs. (162) and (164) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon}&\left(n_\nu + v^j \gamma_{j\nu}\right) \left(\mathsf{S}_T\right)^\nu \\
&= \mathsf{S}_N - \left\{ \frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon} \left[\left(\mathsf{G}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{G}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j \right] \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\mathsf{E}_{T,n} - \mathsf{E}_{T,\gamma}\right) \right\} \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \qquad (166)
\end{aligned}$$

for the contribution of the spacetime divergence to the right-hand side of Eq. (161).

Turning to the momentum space divergence, from Eqs. (146) and (149) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon}&\left(n_\nu + v^j \gamma_{j\nu}\right) \left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\nu \\
&= \mathsf{M}_N - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon}\left(-\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \left\{ \Lambda \epsilon^2 \left[\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j \right] \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \Lambda \epsilon^2 \left[\left(\mathsf{O}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j \right] \right\} \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \qquad (167)
\end{aligned}$$

for the contribution of the momentum space divergence to the right-hand side of Eq. (161). Note that the long term following M_N results from pulling $1/\epsilon$ through the energy derivative; therefore its discretized form is dictated by the discretization chosen for Eqs. (146) and (149).

The sum of Eqs. (166) and (167) equals Eq. (161), as required, because (a) the gravitational redshift terms from the momentum space divergence cancel the gravitational force and power terms from the spacetime divergence, and (b) the observer corrections from the momentum space divergence cancel the 'extra' terms from pulling Λ and v^k through the time and space derivatives. That is, (a)

$$0 = \frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon} \left[\left(\mathsf{G}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{G}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j \right] + \frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon^2} \left[\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j \right], \qquad (168)$$

and (b)

$$0 = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\mathsf{E}_{T,n} - \mathsf{E}_{T,\gamma}\right) + \frac{\Lambda}{\epsilon^2} \left[\left(\mathsf{O}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j \right]. \qquad (169)$$

These cancellations emerge in a surprisingly tractable way: the gravitational redshift and observer correction terms from the normal and tangent projections of the momentum space divergence combine in just the right way to make use of Eqs. (139)-(141), which relate the Eulerian projections $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{Y}^\mu$, $\mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ (see Eq. (129)) to the Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{T}^{\nu\mu}$ (see Eq. (85)), i.e. the energy density $\mathcal{E}$, momentum density $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and stress $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ measured by an Eulerian observer. In particular, combining Eqs. (147) and (150) using Eqs. (139)-(141) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j = -\epsilon\, \alpha \sqrt{\gamma} &\left[\frac{\left(\mathcal{E} v^i - \mathcal{F}^i\right)}{\alpha} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^i} - \mathcal{F}_k v^i \frac{\partial \beta^k}{\partial x^i} \right. \\
&\left. - \mathcal{S}^{ki} v^m \frac{\partial \gamma_{ki}}{\partial x^m} + \mathcal{S}^{ki} K_{ki} \right]. \qquad (170)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this and Eqs. (93) and (97) into Eq. (168), the term-by-term cancellations are apparent. Similarly, combining Eqs. (148) and (151) using Eqs. (139)-(141) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathsf{O}_{T,n}\right) - v^j \left(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j = -\frac{\epsilon}{\Lambda} \alpha \sqrt{\gamma} &\left[\mathcal{E} n^\mu \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial x^\mu} + \mathcal{F}^i \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial x^i} \right. \\
&\left. - \mathcal{F}_k n^\mu \frac{\partial \left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^\mu} - \mathcal{S}_k{}^i \frac{\partial \left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^i} \right]. \qquad (171)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this and Eqs. (163) and (165) into Eq. (169), once again the term-by-term cancellations are apparent.

This analytic demonstration of the consistency of our conservative four-momentum moment equations with a conservative number moment equation ideally should be repeated in the discretized case in order to discover discretizations that are faithful to this consistency.

IV. CONCLUSION

We now assemble the expressions obtained in Secs. III B-III D into conservative 3+1 general relativistic variable Eddington tensor radiation transport equations. These four equations are conservation laws for the energy and momentum carried by the neutrino radiation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{D}_{T,n}\right)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{F}_{T,n}\right)^i}{\partial x^i} + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \left[\epsilon^2 \left(\mathsf{R}_{T,n} + \mathsf{O}_{T,n}\right)\right] \\
= \mathsf{G}_{T,n} + \mathsf{C}_{T,n}, \qquad (172)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{D}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \left(\mathsf{F}_{T,\gamma}\right)^i{}_j}{\partial x^i} + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \left\{\epsilon^2 \left[\left(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j + \left(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j\right]\right\} \\
= \left(\mathsf{G}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j + \left(\mathsf{C}_{T,\gamma}\right)_j. \qquad (173)
\end{aligned}$$

The global 'lab frame' spacetime coordinates t and x^i are those associated with the 3+1 formulation of general relativity, in which the line element and metric components $g_{\mu\nu}$ are given by Eqs. (63)-(65). Equations (172) and (173), expressing energy and momentum conservation respectively, come from the projections of the phase space divergence of the monochromatic neutrino stress energy orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice. The projection orthogonal to the spacelike slice is via contraction with n^μ, the unit normal to the spacelike slice, which is also the four-velocity of Eulerian observers (see Eqs. (69) and (70)). The projection tangent to the spacelike slice is via contraction with the orthogonal projector $\gamma_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu$. The momentum space coordinate in these angle-integrated moment equations is the energy $\epsilon = -u_\mu p^\mu$ measured by a Lagrangian observer, whose four-velocity u^μ is that of the fluid. These coordinate choices allow particle/fluid interactions to be evaluated in the comoving frame in the context of Eulerian grid-based approaches to multidimensional spatial dependence.

A rough analogy with conservative formulations of hydrodynamics is evident. The 'conserved' monochromatic energy and momentum densities $\mathsf{D}_{T,n}$ and $(\mathsf{D}_{T,\gamma})_j$ are given by Eqs. (91) and (95). The energy and momentum fluxes $(\mathsf{F}_{T,n})^i$ and $(\mathsf{F}_{T,\gamma})^i{}_j$ are given by Eqs. (92) and (96). These are expressed in terms of the 'Eulerian projections' (see Eq. (85)) of the monochromatic neutrino stress energy $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$—the second momentum angular moment of the distribution function f (see Eq. (111)). These Eulerian projections are the monochromatic energy density $\mathcal{E}$, the momentum density $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and the stress $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ measured by an Eulerian observer (i.e. in the lab frame). These may be expressed (see Appendix B) in terms of the 'Lagrangian projections' of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ (see Eq. (117)), which are the energy density $\mathcal{J}$, the momentum density $\mathcal{H}^\mu$, and the stress $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$ measured by a Lagrangian observer (i.e. in the comoving frame). The closure relations—that is, the Eddington tensors—are defined in terms of these Lagrangian projections. Roughly speaking, the Eulerian and Lagrangian projections are respectively like the 'conserved' and 'primitive' variables in hydrodynamics, while the Eddington tensor closure relation between Lagrangian projections is analogous to the equation of state relating primitive (comoving frame) hydrodynamics variables.

As with self-gravitating hydrodynamics, the presence of gravitational source terms makes Eqs. (172) and (173) more properly 'balance equations' rather than strict conservation laws. The terms $\mathsf{G}_{T,n}$ and $(\mathsf{G}_{T,\gamma})_j$, given by Eqs. (93) and (97), represent the energy and momentum exchange between the neutrinos and the gravitational field as embodied in the spacetime geometry. (If spherical or cylindrical spatial coordinates were used, these source terms also would include the fictitious forces associated with these. For the purpose of discretizing the spatial flux, it would be desirable in this case to factor out the portion of the spatial metric determinant arising from these coordinate choices, such that it would appear (a) in the denominator outside the spatial derivative, and (b) in the numerator inside the derivative, separate from the flux.)

As monochromatic (i.e. energy-dependent) radiation transport equations, Eqs. (172) and (173) contain terms beyond those present in self-gravitating hydrodynamics. First, the source terms

$$\mathsf{C}_{T,n} = -\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\, n_\mu\, q^\mu, \tag{174}$$

$$(\mathsf{C}_{T,\gamma})_j = \alpha\sqrt{\gamma}\, \gamma_{j\mu}\, q^\mu \tag{175}$$

represent the energy and momentum exchange with the fluid, with the relationship of the source q^μ to the collision integral given in Eq. (46). Second, the energy divergences on the left-hand sides of Eqs. (172) and (173) arise from changes in the neutrino energy as measured in the comoving frame due to gravitational redshift—$\mathsf{R}_{T,n}$ and $(\mathsf{R}_{T,\gamma})_j$, see Eqs. (147) and (150)—and the acceleration of the observer riding along with the fluid, $\mathsf{O}_{T,n}$ and $(\mathsf{O}_{T,\gamma})_j$; see Eqs. (148) and (151). These are given in terms of the Eulerian projections (see Eq. (129)) of the monochromatic third momentum angular moment $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ (see Eq. (118)). The Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ can be expressed in terms of the Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ (Section III D), or more directly in terms of the Lagrangian projections (Appendix B). Finally, we note that the energy divergence is conservative with respect to integration over the differential energy volume $\epsilon^2\, d\epsilon$.

While the conservative variable Eddington tensor moment equations express four-momentum exchange between the neutrinos and the fluid, we also have examined in detail the relationship of these to the conservative number exchange equation (see Sections II D and III E). This can be done in a tractable way on a term-by-term basis thanks to our greater elaboration of the momentum space divergence than in previous work. Important conceptual features of our approach include (a) consistent use of what we call 'Eulerian decompositions' and 'Eulerian projections,' which are natural to the 3+1 formulation; and relatedly, (b) a shift from conceptualizing the relationship between the lab and comoving frames from coordinate transformations $L^\mu{}_{\hat{\mu}}$ to the (covariant) relative three-velocity v^μ connecting the four-velocities n^μ and u^μ of Eulerian and Lagrangian observers. Our approach is geometric, in conception if not notation, to an extent that allows us to obtain explicit results while almost completely avoiding encounters with connection coefficients. This understanding of the relationship between conservative four-momentum exchange and conservative number exchange can guide the determination of discretizations of the variable Eddington tensor moment equations that facilitate simultaneous energy and lepton number conservation in numerical simulations, yielding greater confidence in simulation outcomes.

Appendix A: Spacetime divergence

In this appendix we compute the spacetime divergence of a stress-energy tensor with the 3+1 metric. The Eulerian decomposition of a stress-energy tensor is given by Eq. (77) or (78). In particular, we derive contributions to 'conservative' evolution equations for the energy density E and momentum density F_i measured by an Eulerian observer (whose four-velocity is the unit normal n^u to a spacelike slice).

Some relations involving derivatives of the unit normal n^μ and the orthogonal projector $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ will prove useful. The gradient of the unit normal is related to the extrinsic curvature and lapse function by [41]

$$\nabla_\mu n_\nu = -K_{\nu\mu} - \frac{n_\mu}{\alpha}\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x^\nu}. \tag{A1}$$

Because $n^\nu \nabla_\mu n_\nu = \nabla_\mu (n^\nu n_\nu)/2 = 0$; and because $K_{\mu\nu}$

is tangent to the spacelike slice, i.e. spacelike in the lab frame coordinate basis ($n^\mu K_{\mu\nu} = n^\nu K_{\mu\nu} = 0$), the non-vanishing projections of this equation are

$$n^\mu \nabla_\mu n_\nu = \frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^\nu}, \tag{A2}$$

$$\gamma^\mu{}_i \gamma^\nu{}_j \nabla_\mu n_\nu = -K_{ij} \tag{A3}$$

in the lab frame coordinate basis. Eq. (A2) relates the four-acceleration of an Eulerian observer to the gradient of the lapse function. Eq. (A3) relates the spatial part of the gradient of the unit normal to the extrinsic curvature, expressing the fact that the direction of the normal varies with the warp of the slice as embedded in spacetime. Another relation valid in the lab frame coordinate basis for vectors z^μ tangent to the spacelike slice ($z^0 = 0$) is

$$z_\mu \frac{\partial n^\mu}{\partial x^\nu} = -z_i \frac{\partial \beta^i}{\partial x^\nu}. \quad (z^\mu \text{ spacelike}) \tag{A4}$$

This follows from writing

$$z_\mu \frac{\partial n^\mu}{\partial x^\nu} = z_0 \frac{\partial n^0}{\partial x^\nu} + z_i \frac{\partial n^i}{\partial x^\nu} \tag{A5}$$

$$= g_{0i} z^i \frac{\partial n^0}{\partial x^\nu} + z_i \frac{\partial n^i}{\partial x^\nu} \tag{A6}$$

and using $g_{0i} = \beta_i$ and Eq. (69). Finally, and more straightforwardly, the gradient of the orthogonal projector is

$$\nabla_\mu \gamma_{\nu\rho} = n_\rho \nabla_\mu n_\nu + n_\nu \nabla_\mu n_\rho, \tag{A7}$$

thanks to the vanishing covariant derivative of the four-metric $g_{\mu\nu}$.

The projection of the spacetime divergence of a stress-energy tensor orthogonal to the spacelike slice contributes to an energy equation. Contracting the divergence with n_ν and taking it inside the derivative, we have

$$-n_\nu \nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = -\nabla_\mu \left(n_\nu T^{\mu\nu}\right) + T^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu n_\nu. \tag{A8}$$

The first term on the right-hand side is

$$-\nabla_\mu \left(n_\nu T^{\mu\nu}\right) = \nabla_\mu \left(E n^\mu + F^i \gamma^\mu{}_i\right) \tag{A9}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\left[\sqrt{-g}\left(E n^\mu + F^i \gamma^\mu{}_i\right)\right] \tag{A10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\sqrt{\gamma} E\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\left[\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\alpha F^i - \beta^i E\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

where we have used Eqs. (68), (69), and (78). In substituting Eq. (78) into the second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (A8), the first two terms vanish:

$$\left(E\, n^\mu + F^i \gamma^\mu{}_i\right) n^\nu \nabla_\mu n_\nu = 0, \tag{A12}$$

because $n^\nu \nabla_\mu n_\nu = \nabla_\mu (n^\nu n_\nu)/2 = 0$. The remaining terms give

$$T^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu n_\nu = \frac{F^i}{\alpha} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^i} - S^{ij} K_{ij}, \tag{A13}$$

thanks to Eqs. (A2) and (A3). Putting Eqs. (A11) and (A13) together,

$$\begin{aligned} -n_\nu \nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} &= \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\sqrt{\gamma} E\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\left[\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\alpha F^i - \beta^i E\right)\right] \\ &\quad + \frac{F^i}{\alpha} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^i} - S^{ij} K_{ij} \end{aligned} \tag{A14}$$

is the portion of the spacetime divergence orthogonal to the spacelike slice.

The projection of the spacetime divergence tangent to the spacelike slice, which contributes to a momentum equation, is a bit more involved. Contracting with the orthogonal projector and taking it inside the derivative,

$$\gamma_{j\nu} \nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu \left(\gamma_{j\nu} T^{\mu\nu}\right) - T^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \gamma_{j\nu}. \tag{A15}$$

The first term on the right-hand side is

$$\nabla_\mu \left(\gamma_{j\nu} T^{\mu\nu}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\left(\sqrt{-g}\, \gamma_{j\nu} T^{\mu\nu}\right) - \Gamma^\rho_{j\mu} \gamma_{\rho\nu} T^{\mu\nu}. \tag{A16}$$

The first term on the right-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\left(\sqrt{-g}\, \gamma_{j\nu} T^{\mu\nu}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\left[\sqrt{-g}\left(F_j n^\mu + S^i{}_j \gamma^\mu{}_i\right)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{A17}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\sqrt{\gamma} F_j\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\left[\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\alpha S^i{}_j - \beta^i F_j\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{A18}$$

The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (A16) is

$$-\Gamma^\rho_{j\mu} \gamma_{\rho\nu} T^{\mu\nu} = -\Gamma^\rho_{j\mu}\left(F_\rho n^\mu + S^\mu{}_\rho\right). \tag{A19}$$

The first term on the right-hand side is

$$-\Gamma^\rho_{j\mu} F_\rho n^\mu = F_\rho \left(\partial_j n^\rho - \nabla_j n^\rho\right) \tag{A20}$$

$$= -F_i \frac{\partial \beta^i}{\partial x^j} + F^i K_{ji}, \tag{A21}$$

where the first and second terms follow from Eqs. (A4) and (A3) respectively. The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (A19) is

$$-\Gamma^\rho_{j\mu} S^\mu{}_\rho = -\Gamma^\rho_{ji}\, g_{\rho k}\, S^{ik} \tag{A22}$$

$$= -\frac{S^{ik}}{2}\left(\frac{\partial \gamma_{ki}}{\partial x^j} + \frac{\partial \gamma_{jk}}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial \gamma_{ji}}{\partial x^k}\right). \tag{A23}$$

The last two terms in parentheses are antisymmetric in i, k and vanish upon contraction with the symmetric S^{ik}, leaving

$$-\Gamma^\rho_{j\mu} S^\mu{}_\rho = -\frac{S^{ik}}{2} \frac{\partial \gamma_{ik}}{\partial x^j}. \tag{A24}$$

With Eqs. (A21) and (A24), Eq. (A19) becomes

$$-\Gamma^{\rho}_{j\mu}\gamma_{\rho\nu}T^{\mu\nu} = -F_i\,\frac{\partial\beta^i}{\partial x^j} + F^i K_{ji} - \frac{S^{ik}}{2}\frac{\partial\gamma_{ik}}{\partial x^j}. \tag{A25}$$

This, together with Eq. (A18), yields

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\mu\left(\gamma_{j\nu}T^{\mu\nu}\right) = {} & \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\sqrt{\gamma}F_j\right)\\ & +\frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\left[\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\alpha S^i{}_j - \beta^i F_j\right)\right]\\ & -F_i\,\frac{\partial\beta^i}{\partial x^j} + F^i K_{ji} - \frac{S^{ik}}{2}\frac{\partial\gamma_{ik}}{\partial x^j}\end{aligned} \tag{A26}$$

for Eq. (A16), the first term of Eq. (A15). The second term of Eq. (A15) is less complicated. Using Eq. (A7),

$$\begin{aligned}-T^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\gamma_{j\nu} &= -T^{\mu\nu}\left(n_\nu\nabla_\mu n_j + n_j\nabla_\mu n_\nu\right) & \text{(A27)}\\ &= -T^{\mu\nu}n_\nu\nabla_\mu n_j, & \text{(A28)}\end{aligned}$$

in which the second term has vanished due to Eq. (70). This can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned}-T^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\gamma_{j\nu} &= \left(En^\mu + F^i\gamma^\mu{}_i\right)\nabla_\mu n_j & \text{(A29)}\\ &= \frac{E}{\alpha}\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x^j} - F^i K_{ij}, & \text{(A30)}\end{aligned}$$

where we successively have used Eq. (78) and Eqs. (A2) and (A3). Adding Eqs. (A26) and (A30) and allowing for the symmetry of K_{ij}, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{j\nu}\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = {} & \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\sqrt{\gamma}F_j\right)\\ & +\frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\left[\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\alpha S^i{}_j - \beta^i F_j\right)\right]\\ & +\frac{E}{\alpha}\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x^j} - F_i\,\frac{\partial\beta^i}{\partial x^j} - \frac{S^{ik}}{2}\frac{\partial\gamma_{ik}}{\partial x^j}\end{aligned} \tag{A31}$$

for the projection of the spacetime divergence tangent to the spacelike slice.

Appendix B: Eulerian and Lagrangian projections

In this appendix we express the Eulerian projections $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{F}^\mu$, and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ (see Eqs. (111) and (85)), and $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{Y}^\mu$, $\mathcal{X}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{W}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ (see Eqs. (118) and (129)), in terms the angular moments $\mathcal{J}$, $\mathcal{H}^\mu$, $\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ (see Eqs. (102)-(105)), which are also the Lagrangian projections of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ and—up to a factor ϵ—of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ (see Eqs. (117) and (124)). Because the Lagrangian projections are spacelike in the comoving frame, we eliminate u^μ in favor of v^μ and (in free indices) n^μ. In the case of the neutrino energy density, flux, and stress, we also show how the relations are consistent with published results in special relativity obtained with Lorentz transformations [27], rather than with projections as done here.

We use four basic types of contractions, which follow from Eq. (135):

$$\begin{aligned}n_\mu u^\mu &= \Lambda, & \text{(B1)}\\ n_\mu Z^\mu &= -v_\mu Z^\mu, \quad (u_\mu Z^\mu = 0) & \text{(B2)}\\ \gamma_{\rho\mu}u^\mu &= \Lambda v_\rho, & \text{(B3)}\\ \gamma_{\rho\mu}Z^\mu &= \left(g_{\rho\mu} - n_\rho v_\mu\right)Z^\mu, \quad (u_\mu Z^\mu = 0) & \text{(B4)}\end{aligned}$$

where Z^μ is a stand-in for any spacelike index relative to the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u^μ (i.e. $u_\mu Z^\mu = 0$).

The Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E} &= n_\mu n_\nu\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}, & \text{(B5)}\\ \mathcal{F}_\rho &= -\gamma_{\rho\mu}n_\nu\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}, & \text{(B6)}\\ \mathcal{S}_{\rho\sigma} &= \gamma_{\rho\mu}\gamma_{\sigma\nu}\mathcal{T}^{\mu\nu}. & \text{(B7)}\end{aligned}$$

Using Eqs. (117) and (B1)-(B4) on the right-hand sides, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E} = {} & \Lambda^2\mathcal{J} + 2\Lambda v_\mu\mathcal{H}^\mu + v_\mu v_\nu\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}, & \text{(B8)}\\ \mathcal{F}_\rho = {} & \Lambda^2 v_\rho\mathcal{J} + \Lambda\left(g_{\rho\mu} - n_\rho v_\mu\right)\mathcal{H}^\mu\\ & +\Lambda v_\rho v_\mu\mathcal{H}^\mu + \left(g_{\rho\mu} - n_\rho v_\mu\right)v_\nu\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}, & \text{(B9)}\\ \mathcal{S}_{\rho\sigma} = {} & \Lambda^2 v_\rho v_\sigma\mathcal{J} + \Lambda\left(g_{\rho\mu} - n_\rho v_\mu\right)v_\sigma\mathcal{H}^\mu\\ & +\Lambda\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)v_\rho\mathcal{H}^\mu\\ & +\left(g_{\rho\mu} - n_\rho v_\mu\right)\left(g_{\sigma\nu} - n_\sigma v_\nu\right)\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}. & \text{(B10)}\end{aligned}$$

The Eulerian projections of $\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z} &= -n_\mu n_\nu n_\rho\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}, & \text{(B11)}\\ \mathcal{Y}_\sigma &= \gamma_{\sigma\mu}n_\nu n_\rho\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}, & \text{(B12)}\\ \mathcal{X}_{\sigma\kappa} &= -\gamma_{\sigma\mu}\gamma_{\kappa\nu}n_\rho\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}, & \text{(B13)}\\ \mathcal{W}_{\sigma\kappa\lambda} &= \gamma_{\sigma\mu}\gamma_{\kappa\nu}\gamma_{\lambda\rho}\mathcal{U}^{\mu\nu\rho}. & \text{(B14)}\end{aligned}$$

Using Eqs. (124) and (B1)-(B4) on the right-hand sides, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z} = {} & \epsilon\left(\Lambda^3\mathcal{J} + 3\Lambda^2 v_\mu\mathcal{H}^\mu + 3\Lambda v_\mu v_\nu\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}\right.\\ & \left.+v_\mu v_\nu v_\rho\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho},\right) & \text{(B15)}\\ \mathcal{Y}_\sigma = {} & \epsilon\left[\Lambda^3 v_\sigma\mathcal{J} + \Lambda^2\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)\mathcal{H}^\mu + 2\Lambda^2 v_\sigma v_\mu\mathcal{H}^\mu\right.\\ & +2\Lambda\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)v_\nu\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda v_\sigma v_\mu v_\nu\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}\\ & \left.+\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)v_\nu v_\rho\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}\right], & \text{(B16)}\\ \mathcal{X}_{\sigma\kappa} = {} & \epsilon\left[\Lambda^3 v_\sigma v_\kappa\mathcal{J} + \Lambda^2\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)v_\kappa\mathcal{H}^\mu\right.\\ & +\Lambda^2\left(g_{\kappa\mu} - n_\kappa v_\mu\right)v_\sigma\mathcal{H}^\mu + \Lambda^2 v_\sigma v_\kappa v_\mu\mathcal{H}^\mu\\ & +\Lambda\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)\left(g_{\kappa\nu} - n_\kappa v_\nu\right)\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}\\ & +\Lambda\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)v_\nu\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} + \Lambda\left(g_{\kappa\mu} - n_\kappa v_\mu\right)v_\nu\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}\\ & \left.+\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)\left(g_{\kappa\nu} - n_\kappa v_\nu\right)v_\rho\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}\right], & \text{(B17)}\\ \mathcal{W}_{\sigma\kappa\lambda} = {} & \epsilon\left[\Lambda^3 v_\sigma v_\kappa v_\lambda\mathcal{J} + \Lambda^2\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)v_\kappa v_\lambda\mathcal{H}^\mu\right.\\ & +\Lambda^2\left(g_{\kappa\mu} - n_\kappa v_\mu\right)v_\lambda v_\sigma\mathcal{H}^\mu\\ & +\Lambda^2\left(g_{\lambda\mu} - n_\lambda v_\mu\right)v_\sigma v_\kappa\mathcal{H}^\mu\\ & +\Lambda\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)\left(g_{\kappa\nu} - n_\kappa v_\nu\right)v_\lambda\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}\\ & +\Lambda\left(g_{\kappa\mu} - n_\kappa v_\mu\right)\left(g_{\lambda\nu} - n_\lambda v_\nu\right)v_\sigma\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}\\ & +\Lambda\left(g_{\lambda\mu} - n_\lambda v_\mu\right)\left(g_{\sigma\nu} - n_\sigma v_\nu\right)v_\kappa\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu}\\ & +\left(g_{\sigma\mu} - n_\sigma v_\mu\right)\left(g_{\kappa\nu} - n_\kappa v_\nu\right)\\ & \left.\times\left(g_{\lambda\rho} - n_\lambda v_\rho\right)\mathcal{L}^{\mu\nu\rho}\right]. & \text{(B18)}\end{aligned}$$

We now prepare to compare the (raised index) spatial components of Eqs. (B8)-(B10) with the special relativistic results in Eqs. (182)-(184) of Ref. [27]. In flat spacetime the unit normal of Eq. (69) becomes

$$(n^\mu) = (1,0,0,0)^T\,. \tag{B19}$$

The tetrad $e^\mu{}_{\bar\mu}$ is a Kronecker delta in flat spacetime Cartesian coordinates, so that the composite transformation $L^\mu{}_{\hat\mu}$ of Eq. (7) becomes

$$L^\mu{}_{\hat\mu} = \delta^\mu{}_{\bar\mu}\Lambda^{\bar\mu}{}_{\hat\mu}. \tag{B20}$$

An explicit expression for the Lorentz boost between the orthonormal lab frame and the comoving frame is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Lambda^{\bar 0}{}_{\hat 0} & \Lambda^{\bar 0}{}_{\hat\imath} \\ \Lambda^{\bar\imath}{}_{\hat 0} & \Lambda^{\bar\imath}{}_{\hat\imath} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & \Lambda V_{\hat\imath} \\ \Lambda V^{\bar\imath} & \delta^{\bar\imath}{}_{\hat\imath} + \frac{(\Lambda-1)}{V^2} V^{\bar\imath} V_{\hat\imath} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B21}$$

where

$$V^2 = V^{\bar 1}V_{\hat 1} + V^{\bar 2}V_{\hat 2} + V^{\bar 3}V_{\hat 3}. \tag{B22}$$

It can be shown that

$$\Lambda = \left(1 - V^2\right)^{-1/2} = \left(1 - v^\mu v_\mu\right)^{-1/2} = \left(1 - v^i v_i\right)^{-1/2} \tag{B23}$$

is equal to the Lorentz boost we have been using. The quantities

$$V^{\bar 1} = V_{\hat 1},\ V^{\bar 2} = V_{\hat 2},\ V^{\bar 3} = V_{\hat 3} \tag{B24}$$

are not to be regarded as components of a four-vector, but simply as the three-velocity parameters appearing in the Lorentz boost, expressed in a manner consistent with our index conventions. In flat spacetime the spatial components of the (covariant) three-velocity four-vector v^μ are related to these boost velocity parameters by

$$v^i = \delta^i{}_{\bar\imath} V^{\bar\imath}, \tag{B25}$$

a perhaps expected result that follows from Eqs. (135), (B19), (B20), (B21), and (98). However, we caution that the perhaps less-expected result for the lowered-index comoving frame spatial components of v^μ is

$$v_{\hat\imath} = \Lambda V_{\hat\imath}. \tag{B26}$$

Below we use this to evaluate contractions of the form

$$v_\mu Z^\mu = v_{\hat\imath} Z^{\hat\imath} \tag{B27}$$

$$= \Lambda V_{\hat\imath} Z^{\hat\imath}, \quad (u_\mu Z^\mu = 0) \tag{B28}$$

i.e. contraction with an index that is spacelike relative to the Lagrangian observer four-velocity u^μ.

We are now ready to compare the (raised index) spatial components of Eqs. (B8)-(B10) with the special relativistic results in Eqs. (182)-(184) of Ref. [27], using Eqs. (B19), (B20), (B21), and (B28). Equation (B8) can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{E} = \Lambda^2 \mathcal{J} + 2\Lambda v_{\hat\imath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} + v_{\hat\imath} v_{\hat\jmath} \mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}, \tag{B29}$$

or

$$\mathcal{E} = \Lambda^2 \mathcal{J} + 2\Lambda^2 V_{\hat\imath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} + \Lambda^2 V_{\hat\imath} V_{\hat\jmath} \mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}, \tag{B30}$$

which agrees with Eq. (182) of Ref. [27]. The spatial components of Eq. (B9) are

$$\mathcal{F}^i = \Lambda^2 v^i \mathcal{J} + \Lambda L^i{}_{\hat\imath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} + \Lambda v^i v_{\hat\imath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} + L^i{}_{\hat\imath} v_{\hat\jmath} \mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}, \tag{B31}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^i = \delta^i{}_{\bar\imath} \Big\{ & \Lambda^2 V^{\bar\imath} \mathcal{J} + \Lambda \left[\delta^{\bar\imath}{}_{\hat\imath} + \frac{(\Lambda-1)}{V^2} V^{\bar\imath} V_{\hat\imath} \right] \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} \\ & + \Lambda^2 V^{\bar\imath} V_{\hat\imath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} + \Lambda \left[\delta^{\bar\imath}{}_{\hat\imath} + \frac{(\Lambda-1)}{V^2} V^{\bar\imath} V_{\hat\imath} \right] V_{\hat\jmath} \mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath} \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{B32}$$

which agrees with Eq. (183) of Ref. [27]. The spatial components of Eq. (B9) are

$$\mathcal{S}^{ij} = \Lambda^2 v^i v^j \mathcal{J} + \Lambda L^i{}_{\hat\imath} v^j \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} + \Lambda L^j{}_{\hat\jmath} v^i \mathcal{H}^{\hat\jmath} + L^i{}_{\hat\imath} L^j{}_{\hat\jmath} \mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath}, \tag{B33}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^{ij} = \delta^i{}_{\bar\imath} \delta^j{}_{\bar\jmath} \Big\{ & \Lambda^2 V^{\bar\imath} V^{\bar\jmath} \mathcal{J} + \Lambda \left(\delta^{\bar\imath}{}_{\hat\imath} V^{\bar\jmath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} + \delta^{\bar\jmath}{}_{\hat\jmath} V^{\bar\imath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\jmath} \right) \\ & + 2\Lambda \left[\frac{(\Lambda-1)}{V^2} V^{\bar\imath} V_{\hat\imath} \right] V^{\bar\jmath} \mathcal{H}^{\hat\imath} \\ & + \left[\delta^{\bar\imath}{}_{\hat\imath} + \frac{(\Lambda-1)}{V^2} V^{\bar\imath} V_{\hat\imath} \right] \left[\delta^{\bar\jmath}{}_{\hat\jmath} + \frac{(\Lambda-1)}{V^2} V^{\bar\jmath} V_{\hat\jmath} \right] \mathcal{K}^{\hat\imath\hat\jmath} \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{B34}$$

which agrees with Eq. (184) of Ref. [27].

Appendix C: Momentum space divergence

In this appendix we compute, with the 3+1 metric, expressions entering the momentum space divergence term of the phase space divergence of a monochromatic stress-energy tensor. In particular, we derive contributions to 'conservative' evolution equations for the monochromatic energy density $\mathcal{E}$ and momentum density $\mathcal{F}_i$ measured by an Eulerian observer (whose four-velocity is the unit normal n^μ to a spacelike slice).

We project the momentum space divergence into portions orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice, and find it helpful to also use Eulerian decompositions of the tensors that appear. Our starting points are Eqs. (133) and (134) for the portions of the momentum space divergence orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice:

$$-\, n_\rho \left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\rho = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \left(\epsilon^2\, n_\rho \mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu} \nabla_\mu u_\nu \right), \tag{C1}$$

$$\gamma_{j\rho} \left(\mathsf{M}_T\right)^\rho = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \left(-\epsilon^2\, \gamma_{j\rho} \mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu} \nabla_\mu u_\nu \right). \tag{C2}$$

The Eulerian decomposition of $\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu}$ is given by Eq. (129). The projections orthogonal and tangent to the spacelike slice, which appear in the above two equations, are

$$-\,n_\rho\,\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu} = \mathcal{Z}\,n^\nu n^\mu + \mathcal{Y}^\nu n^\mu + \mathcal{Y}^\mu n^\nu + \mathcal{X}^{\nu\mu}, \tag{C3}$$

$$\gamma_{j\rho}\,\mathcal{U}^{\rho\nu\mu} = \mathcal{Y}_j n^\nu n^\mu + \mathcal{X}_j{}^\nu n^\mu + \mathcal{X}_j{}^\mu n^\nu + \mathcal{W}_j{}^{\nu\mu} \tag{C4}$$

We also use Eq. (135),

$$u^\mu = \Lambda\left(n^\mu + v^\mu\right), \tag{C5}$$

i.e. the Eulerian decomposition of u_ν, in expressing $\nabla_\mu u_\nu$.

There are four types of contractions appearing when either Eq. (C3) or (C4) is contracted with $\nabla_\mu u_\nu$; we consider them in turn, beginning with

$$n^\nu n^\mu \nabla_\mu u_\nu = n^\nu n^\mu \left[\left(n_\nu + v_\nu\right)\partial_\mu \Lambda + \Lambda\,\nabla_\mu n_\nu + \Lambda\,\nabla_\mu v_\nu\right]. \tag{C6}$$

The first term gives

$$n^\nu n^\mu \left(n_\nu + v_\nu\right)\partial_\mu \Lambda = -n^\mu \partial_\mu \Lambda \tag{C7}$$

because of the orthogonality relation $n^\mu v_\mu = 0$. The second term vanishes because $n^\mu n_\mu = -1 =$ constant implies

$$0 = \nabla_\mu\left(n^\nu n_\nu\right) = 2 n^\nu \nabla_\mu n_\nu. \tag{C8}$$

In the third term we use

$$n^\nu \nabla_\mu v_\nu = -v^\nu \nabla_\mu n_\nu, \tag{C9}$$

which follows from $0 = \nabla_\mu\left(n^\nu v_\nu\right)$. The third term becomes

$$n^\nu n^\mu \left(\Lambda\,\nabla_\mu v_\nu\right) = -\frac{\Lambda\,v^i}{\alpha}\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^i}, \tag{C10}$$

where we have used Eq. (A2). All together,

$$n^\nu n^\mu \nabla_\mu u_\nu = -\frac{\Lambda\,v^i}{\alpha}\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^i} - n^\mu \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial x^\mu} \tag{C11}$$

for this type of contraction.

Consider next a contraction of the form

$$A^\nu n^\mu \nabla_\mu u_\nu = A^\nu n^\mu \left[n_\nu\,\partial_\mu \Lambda + \Lambda\,\nabla_\mu n_\nu + \nabla_\mu\left(\Lambda v_\nu\right)\right], \tag{C12}$$

where A^ν is spacelike (i.e. $n_\nu A^\nu = 0$, such that $A^0 = 0$ in the coordinate basis), and we break up the right-hand side differently than in the previous paragraph. The first term vanishes because A^ν is spacelike. The second term gives

$$A^\nu n^\mu \left(\Lambda\,\nabla_\mu n_\nu\right) = \frac{\Lambda\,A^i}{\alpha}\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^i} \tag{C13}$$

thanks again to Eq. (A2). In the third term it will turn out best to raise the index on v_ν before turning the gradient back, in a sense, on n^μ:

$$\begin{aligned}
A^\nu n^\mu \left[\nabla_\mu\left(\Lambda v_\nu\right)\right] &= A_k n^\mu \left[\nabla_\mu\left(\Lambda v^k\right)\right] && \text{(C14)}\\
&= A_k n^\mu \left[\partial_\mu\left(\Lambda v^k\right) + \Gamma^k_{m\mu}\Lambda v^m\right] && \text{(C15)}\\
&= A_k n^\mu \partial_\mu\left(\Lambda v^k\right)\\
&\quad + \Lambda A_k v^m\left(\Gamma^k_{\mu m} n^\mu\right) && \text{(C16)}\\
&= A_k n^\mu \partial_\mu\left(\Lambda v^k\right)\\
&\quad + \Lambda A_k v^m\left(\nabla_m n^k - \partial_m n^k\right) && \text{(C17)}\\
&= A_k n^\mu \partial_\mu\left(\Lambda v^k\right) - \Lambda A^k v^m K_{mk}\\
&\quad + \Lambda A_k v^m \partial_m \beta^k, && \text{(C18)}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Eqs. (A3) and (A4) in the last step. All together,

$$\begin{aligned}
A^\nu n^\mu \nabla_\mu u_\nu = {}& \frac{\Lambda A^i}{\alpha}\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x^i} + \Lambda A_k v^i \frac{\partial \beta^k}{\partial x^i} - \Lambda A^k v^i K_{ik}\\
& + A_k n^\mu \frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^\mu}
\end{aligned} \tag{C19}$$

for this type of contraction.

For the next contraction we return to the first split we used on the right-hand side:

$$A^\mu n^\nu \nabla_\mu u_\nu = \left[\left(n_\nu + v_\nu\right)\partial_\mu \Lambda + \Lambda\,\nabla_\mu n_\nu + \Lambda\,\nabla_\mu v_\nu\right], \tag{C20}$$

where again A^μ is spacelike. The first term gives simply

$$A^\mu n^\nu \left[\left(n_\nu + v_\nu\right)\partial_\mu \Lambda\right] = -A^i \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial x^i}. \tag{C21}$$

From Eq. (C8), the second term vanishes. In the third term we use Eqs. (C9) and (A3), whence

$$\begin{aligned}
A^\mu n^\nu \left(\Lambda\,\nabla_\mu v_\nu\right) &= -\Lambda A^\mu v^\nu \nabla_\mu n_\nu && \text{(C22)}\\
&= \Lambda A^i v^k K_{ki}. && \text{(C23)}
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we have

$$A^\mu n^\nu \nabla_\mu u_\nu = \Lambda A^i v^k K_{ki} - A^i \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial x^i} \tag{C24}$$

for this type of contraction.

For the final contraction, one with a spacelike tensor $B^{\nu\mu}$, we return to the alternative

$$B^{\nu\mu} \nabla_\mu u_\nu = B^{\nu\mu}\left[n_\nu\,\partial_\mu \Lambda + \Lambda\,\nabla_\mu n_\nu + \nabla_\mu\left(\Lambda v_\nu\right)\right] \tag{C25}$$

on the right-hand side. The first term vanishes because $B^{\nu\mu}$ is spacelike. The second term immediately yields, via Eq. (A3),

$$B^{\nu\mu}\left(\Lambda\,\nabla_\mu n_\nu\right) = \Lambda B^{ki} \nabla_i n_k = -\Lambda B^{ki} K_{ki}. \tag{C26}$$

In the third term it once again will turn out best to raise the index on v_ν. We find

$$\begin{aligned} B^{\nu\mu}\left[\nabla_\mu\left(\Lambda v_\nu\right)\right] &= {B_\nu}^\mu \nabla_\mu\left(\Lambda v^\nu\right) && \text{(C27)}\\ &= {B_\nu}^\mu\left[\partial_\mu\left(\Lambda v^\nu\right)+\Gamma^\nu_{\sigma\mu}\left(\Lambda v^\sigma\right)\right] && \text{(C28)}\\ &= {B_k}^i\partial_i\left(\Lambda v^k\right)\\ &\quad +\Lambda B^{ki}v^m g_{k\nu}\Gamma^\nu_{mi} && \text{(C29)}\\ &= {B_k}^i\partial_i\left(\Lambda v^k\right)\\ &\quad +\Lambda B^{ki}v^m\left(\partial_i\gamma_{km}\right.\\ &\qquad \left.+\partial_m\gamma_{ki}-\partial_k\gamma_{mi}\right) && \text{(C30)}\\ &= {B_k}^i\partial_i\left(\Lambda v^k\right)\\ &\quad +\Lambda B^{ki}v^m\partial_m\gamma_{ki}, && \text{(C31)} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, the first and third terms—antisymmetric in i and k—vanish upon contraction with the symmetric B^{ki}. Altogether, we have

$$B^{\nu\mu}\nabla_\mu u_\nu = \Lambda B^{ki}v^m\frac{\partial\gamma_{ki}}{\partial x^m}-\Lambda B^{ki}K_{ki}+{B_k}^i\frac{\partial\left(\Lambda v^k\right)}{\partial x^i} \tag{C32}$$

for this type of contraction.

In summary, Eqs. (C11), (C19), (C24), and (C32) exhibit the four types of contractions appearing when either Eq. (C3) or (C4) is contracted with $\nabla_\mu u_\nu$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research and the Office of Nuclear Physics, U.S. Department of Energy.

---

[1] A. Mezzacappa, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **55**, 467 (2005).

[2] K. Kotake, K. Sato, and K. Takahashi, Rep. Prog. Phys. **69**, 971 (2006).

[3] H.-T. Janka, arXiv:1206.2503 (2012).

[4] B. Dasgupta, Proc. of Sci. **ICHEP 2010**, 294 (2010).

[5] G. G. Raffelt, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **217**, 95 (2011).

[6] A. Dighe, in *Proceedings of the Hamburg Neutrinos from Supernova Explosions, HAνSE 2011, July 19-23, 2011, Hamburg, Germany,* DESY Proceedings Series, edited by A. Mirizzi, P. D. Serpico, and G. Sigl (Verlag Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, 2011) pp. 101–112.

[7] S. Chakraborty, T. Fischer, A. Mirizzi, N. Saviano, and R. Tomàs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 151101 (2011).

[8] Y. Suwa, K. Kotake, T. Takiwaki, M. Liebendörfer, and K. Sato, Astrophys. J. **738**, 165 (2011).

[9] B. Dasgupta, E. P. O'Connor, and C. D. Ott, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 065008 (2012).

[10] S. Sarikas, G. G. Raffelt, L. Hüdepohl, and H.-T. Janka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 061101 (2012).

[11] N. Saviano, S. Chakraborty, T. Fischer, and A. Mirizzi, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 113002 (2012).

[12] S. Sarikas, I. Tamborra, G. Raffelt, L. Hüdepohl, and H.-T. Janka, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 113007 (2012).

[13] O. Pejcha, B. Dasgupta, and T. A. Thompson, Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc. , in press (2012).

[14] For additional detail on the scheme used in the simulations reported in Ref. [38], see Appendix A of Ref. [45] and Sec. 4.7 of Ref. [36].

[15] See the Appendix of Ref. [37].

[16] F. D. Swesty and E. S. Myra, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. **181**, 1 (2009).

[17] M. Rampp and H. Janka, Astron. Astrophys. **396**, 361 (2002).

[18] B. Müller, H.-T. Janka, and H. Dimmelmeier, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. **189**, 104 (2010).

[19] M. Obergaulinger and H.-T. Janka, arXiv:1101.1198 (2011).

[20] M. Shibata, K. Kiuchi, Y. Sekiguchi, and Y. Suwa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **125**, 1255 (2011).

[21] T. Kuroda, K. Kotake, and T. Takiwaki, Astrophys. J. **755**, 11 (2012).

[22] E. O'Connor and C. D. Ott, arXiv:1207.1100 (2012).

[23] E. Endeve, C. Y. Cardall, and A. Mezzacappa, in preparation (2012).

[24] E. J. Lentz, A. Mezzacappa, O. E. Bronson Messer, M. Liebendörfer, W. R. Hix, and S. W. Bruenn, Astrophys. J. **747** (2012).

[25] R. W. Lindquist, Ann. Phys. (NY) **37**, 487 (1966).

[26] D. Mihalas, Astrophys. J. **237**, 574 (1980).

[27] A. Munier and R. Weaver, Comp. Phys. Rep. **3**, 127 (1986).

[28] A. Munier and R. Weaver, Comp. Phys. Rep. **3**, 165 (1986).

[29] H. Riffert, Astrophys. J. **310** (1986).

[30] A. Mezzacappa and R. A. Matzner, Astrophys. J. **343**, 853 (1989).

[31] P. J. Schinder, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 1673 (1988).

[32] C. Y. Cardall and A. Mezzacappa, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 023006 (2003).

[33] J. Ehlers, in *Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi" Course XLVII: General Relativity and Cosmology,* edited by R. K. Sachs (Academic Press, New York, 1971) pp. 1–70.

[34] W. Israel, in *General Relativity: Papers in Honour of J. L. Synge*, edited by L. O'Raifeartaigh (Clarendon, Oxford, 1972) pp. 201–241.

[35] K. S. Thorne, Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc. **194**, 439 (1981).

[36] M. Liebendörfer, O. E. B. Messer, A. Mezzacappa, S. W. Bruenn, C. Y. Cardall, and F. Thielemann, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. **150**, 263 (2004).

[37] A. Burrows, E. Livne, L. Dessart, C. D. Ott, and J. Murphy, Astrophys. J. **655**, 416 (2007).

[38] S. W. Bruenn, A. Mezzacappa, W. R. Hix, J. M. Blondin, P. Marronetti, O. E. B. Messer, C. J. Dirk, and S. Yoshida, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **180**, 012018 (2009).

[39] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W.H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco, 1973).

[40] J. W. York, Jr., in *Gravitational Radiation*, edited by N. Deruelle and T. Piran (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983) pp. 175–201.

[41] E. Gourgoulhon, arXiv:gr-qc/0703035 (2007).

[42] M. Alcubierre, *Introduction to 3+1 Numerical Relativity* (Oxford University Press, 2008).

[43] T. W. Baumgarte and S. L. Shapiro, *Numerical Relativity: Solving Einstein's Equations on the Computer* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[44] A. M. Anile, S. Pennisi, and M. Sammartino, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré **56A**, 49 (1992).

[45] S. W. Bruenn, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. **58**, 771 (1985).